

JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ANNUAL REPORT OF PROGRESS

2001- 02 SCHOOL YEAR

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr.
State District Superintendent

August 29, 2002

JERSEY CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mrs. Suzanne Mack, Chairperson
Mr. Franklin Williams, Vice Chairperson
Rev. Edward Allen
Mr. Edward Cheatham
Mr. Anthony Cucci
Mr. Terrance Curran
Mr. William De Rosa
Mrs. Willie Flood
Mr. Sergio Lamboy

Dr. Charles T. Epps, Jr., State District Superintendent of Schools
Mr. Francis X. Dooley, Deputy Superintendent
Ms. Joann Gilman, Business Administrator
Dr. Joanne Kenny, Associate Superintendent—Programs/Services
Dr. Adele Macula, Associate Superintendent—Curriculum & Instruction
Mrs. Priscilla Petrosky, Associate Superintendent—Special Education
Dr. William Ronzitti, Associate Superintendent—Division A
Mr. Franklin Walker, Associate Superintendent—Division B
Dr. Nicholas A. Duva, Director—Research, Planning & Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	6
SECTION I: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	8
A. BENCHMARK TABLE	9
B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES	10
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS	10
Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary & Middle Schools	10
Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools/High School Task Force.....	14
Educational Technology Support Initiatives	19
Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees	21
Extended Day/Super Saturdays.....	22
Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages	23
Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program	24
Alternative Education	27
Staff Development Programs	30

Corrective Action School-Level Plans	37
Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students	38
Support by Administrative Staff.....	40

SECTION II: COMPLIANCE 41

CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS (CAPs)	42
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—ATTENDANCE RATE	49
SUMMARY STUDENT BEHAVIOR INDICATORS—DROPOUT RATE	51

SECTION III: ABBOTT IMPLEMENTATION 53

IMPLEMENTATION OF 6A:24—URBAN EDUCATION REFORM REGULATIONS	54
A. School-by-School Implementation Progress Chart (Updated)	55
B. Early Childhood Service Goals (Updated)	88
C. Class Size Reduction School-by-School Summary	89
D. School-by-School SMT Status Reports	119
E. Report on the Implementation of the District’s Accountability Plan.....	129

SECTION IV: COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	130
Involving Parents in the Education of Their Children.....	131
Involving Community-Based Organizations in Support of the Delivery of a Thorough and Efficient Education	145
 APPENDIX A: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA).....	147
 APPENDIX B: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA)	154
 APPENDIX C: SUMMARY STUDENT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	
Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA).....	158

INTRODUCTION

We are pleased and proud to present our ***Annual Report of Progress*** for the 2001-02 school year.

The Strategic Plan for 2001-02 consisted of three major objectives: improve student achievement, improve student attendance and reduce student dropout rate. The district was successful in the areas of student attendance, which now indicates a three-year average of 93.3% (compared to 92.0% in 2000-01), and in the dropout rate, which now stands at 9.4% (in comparison to 9.5% in 2000-01). Both of these areas have maintained compliance with Code requirements. As well, the district was very successful in raising 4th grade student achievement, and partially successful at the 8th grade level. Student results in all areas are as follows:

Results on the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment

- The district passing rate on the Language Arts section of the ESPA **increased** by 10.6 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 71.0% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Mathematics section of the ESPA **increased** by 9.4 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 48.3% of the students passed in this area.

Results on the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment

- The district passing rate on the Language Arts Literacy section of the GEPA **decreased** by 4.0 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 65.9% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Mathematics section of the GEPA **decreased** by 4.8 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 53.9% of the students passed in this area.
- The district passing rate on the Science section of the GEPA **increased** by 0.3 percentage point. The 2001-02 actual found that 57.3% of the students passed in this area.

Results of Student Behavior Indicators

- The district attendance rate **increased** from 93.3% to 93.5% in 2001-02.

- The three-year district average attendance rate **increased** from 92.0 % to 93.3% in 2001-02.
- The district dropout rate **decreased** from 9.5% to 9.4% in 2001-02.

As outlined in the body of this Report, ***the district has successfully addressed virtually all of the strategies for improvement included in our District Strategic Plan for 2001-02.*** In addition, major new initiatives were begun during the school year. These new initiatives include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Introduction of Data Warehousing, to increase access to accurate information, and data-based decision-making;
- Development of an off-site high school "Re-Entry" Program, to allow students to make a successful adjustment to the secondary level;
- Implementation of the ECLIPSE Program, to provide training and support to aspiring administrative and supervisory personnel;
- Reorganization of the Personnel Department;
- Reconstitution of Snyder and P.S. #15;
- Planning for Smaller Learning Communities in the form of 9th Grade Academies and career specialties in our largest comprehensive high schools;
- 8th to 9th grade transition activities to support our students as they enter high school;
- Development of a new model of prevention and intervention from our programs and services department, and submission of a \$4.5 million federal grant application to fund the effort;
- An increase in the capacity of our schools to address student learning and behavior problems within the general education program through re-design of our Pupil Assistance Teams and standardization of our pre-referral intervention procedures;
- Implementation of expanded Early Literacy Initiatives, including new curriculum frameworks, instructional materials, assessment practices and professional development activities; and,
- Creation of a budget development and review process that will enable us to maintain the instructional and programmatic integrity of our schools despite budget cutbacks.

**SECTION I:
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

A. BENCHMARK TABLE										
Indicator		Actual 1995-96	Actual 1996-97	Actual 1997-98	Actual 1998-99	Actual 1999-00	Actual 2000-01	Benchmark 2001-02	Actual 2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT ¹	Language Arts				39.9	34.4	60.4	62.5	71.0	8.5
	Mathematics				42.4	45.0	38.9	44.8	48.3	3.5
	Science				66.4	68.7	68.2	69.1		
GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT ²	Language Arts				76.2	74.5	69.9	70.9	65.9	-5.0
	Mathematics				48.3	48.4	58.7	61.3	53.9	-7.4
	Science					48.2	57.0	59.9	57.3	-2.6
HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST ³	Reading	67.2	65.3	74.9	69.1	73.0	73.0			
	Mathematics	71.4	73.5	69.8	78.7	81.1	79.9			
	Writing	79.2	75.7	78.5	85.6	85.0	87.6			
HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT	Reading							63.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	Mathematics							69.9	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	Writing							72.6	Not available as of 8/29/02	
STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)	Year-End Attendance Rate	89.4	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.2	93.3	89.5	93.5	4.0
	3-Year Average Attendance Rate	88.9	89.9	90.7	90.7	91.4	92.0	92.0	93.3	1.3
	Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	13.27	14.6*	10.0	9.3	9.92	9.5	Maintain State Standard	9.4	-0.6

¹1998-99 figures as reported in the May 1999 State Summary Book (Revised January 2001); 1999-00 figures as reported in the May 2000 State Summary Book (January 2001); 2000-01 figures as reported in the May 2001 State Summary Book (December 2001); 2001-02 figures as reported in the *Elementary School Proficiency Assessment Summary of District Performance* (Report Printed 8/09/02)

²1998-99 figures as reported in the March 1999 State Summary book (December 1999); 1999-00 figures as reported in the March 2000 State Summary Book (January 2001); 2000-01 figures as reported in the March 2001 State Summary Book (December 2001); 2001-02 figures as reported in the *Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment Summary of District Performance* (Report Printed 7/01/02)

³Figures as reported by district-compiled aggregate calculations

*Figure reported at the end of the 1996-97 school year. After the report was submitted, minor changes were made & the new dropout rate became 14.93%.

= Met or Exceeded State Standard

B. EVALUATION OF STRATEGIES

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO SCHOOLS:

Focus on Improvement in the City's Elementary & Middle Schools

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 13):

- Continue to assist schools with development of school-based budgets.
- Ensure that the district curriculum is aligned to NJCCCS.
- Expect careful test analysis on the school level and articulation with supervisors regarding specific staff development needs.
- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.
- Provide the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors will be responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors.
- Expand the Reading Recovery Program.
- Continue technology efforts of the district, including the development of student technology standards.
- Continue to involve guidance counselors in the development of programs and referral of students and their families to community social agencies.

- Keep parents informed of students' progress and schedule appointments with the guidance counselor to sign contracts of cooperation when their children do not meet the standard for passing State assessments or are found to be "at risk" after taking diagnostic examinations.
- Encourage teacher collaboration via Professional Development Schools.
- Focus on mathematics by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance.
 - Implement the Core Curriculum Content Standards, which, along with their cumulative progress indicators, define expectations for student learning.
 - Use the New Jersey Mathematics Curriculum Framework as a resource to provide practical guidance to implement the Mathematics Standards.
 - Develop students' ability to solve problems, communicate about mathematics, make connections within mathematics and between mathematics and other subjects and reason mathematically.
 - Familiarize students with the format of the ESPA and GEPA. Include multiple choice, short-constructed responses and open-ended questions on assessments that are administered under testing conditions. Teachers and students must be thoroughly familiar with the scoring rubrics for open-ended questions. Both teachers and students must use the scoring rubric (0-3) when assessing open-ended responses.
 - Incorporate test-taking skills and note-taking strategies where appropriate.
 - Develop students' thinking ability by asking questions that check knowledge and understanding, requesting an explanation of the thought process used (requiring analysis, prediction, evaluation and generalization) when solving problems.
 - Reflect cooperative practices in mathematics lessons so that students are given opportunities to explore and develop concepts.
 - Teach students how and when to use calculators as tools to facilitate the problem solving process.
 - Develop independent thinkers by providing students with opportunities to solve problems without being prompted by the teacher.
 - Emphasize understanding (not rote learning), applications (not abstractions), problem solving (not drill), and thinking (not recall).
 - Administer sample ESPA and GEPA.
- Focus on language arts by implementing district-required strategies to improve ESPA and GEPA performance.

- Review format of the tests with teachers.
- Share activities in Language Arts Literacy Curriculum Frameworks.
- Use the New Jersey Language Arts Curriculum Framework as a resource to provide practical guidance to implement the Language Arts Standards.
- Present district strategies in reading/writing.
- Conduct grade level meetings that connect literacy with assessment.
- Review practice samples, disseminate information and give suggestions for improvement.
- Engage teachers in speculating and writing about picture prompts and analyzing poem prompts.
- Continue to develop midterm and final exams to mirror the ESPA/GEPA format.
- Disseminate the newly prepared *Language Arts Resource Guide* including framework activities and test specifications.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Implementation of the above strategies resulted in the following at the elementary/middle school level:

Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA)

Our efforts to improve student performance on a district level for our fourth grade students were very successful. In Language Arts Literacy, the district passing rate increased by 10.6% over 2000-01, and surpassed the benchmark of 62.5 by 8.5 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 71.0% of students passed this section of the test. In Mathematics, the district passing rate increased by 9.4% over 2000-01, and surpassed the benchmark of 44.8 by 3.5 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 48.3% of students passed this section of the test.

Following is a summary of individual school results:

- On the Language Arts Literacy section of the ESPA, 23 of 27 schools improved, as did the district as a whole. As well, 21 schools met or exceeded their benchmark for 2001-02.
- On the Mathematics section of the ESPA, 21 of 27 schools improved, as did the district as a whole. As well, 17 schools met or exceeded their benchmark for 2001-02.

Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA)

Our efforts to improve student performance on a district level for our eighth grade students were successful in one of the three areas tested. In Language Arts Literacy, the district passing rate decreased by 4% from 2000-01, and fell below the benchmark of 70.9 by 5 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 65.9% of students passed this section of the test. In Mathematics, the district passing rate decreased by 4.8% from 2000-01, and fell below the benchmark of 61.3 by 7.4 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 53.9% of students passed this section of the test. In Science, the district passing rate increased by .3% over 2000-01, yet fell below the benchmark of 59.9 by 2.6 percentage points. The 2001-02 actual found that 57.3% of students passed this section of the test.

Following is a summary of individual school results:

- On the Language Arts Literacy section of the GEPA, 8 of 25 schools improved. As well, 5 schools met or exceeded their benchmark for 2001-02.
- On the Mathematics section of the GEPA, 9 of 25 schools improved. As well, 6 schools met or exceeded their benchmark for 2001-02.
- On the Science section of the GEPA, 11 of 25 schools improved. As well, 10 schools met or exceeded their benchmark for 2001-02.

Our successful performance at the 4th grade level can be attributed to several factors, including our clear focus on early childhood education and adherence to planned strategies throughout the school year. Marginal performance at the 8th grade level demonstrates the need for the district to increase its school-level emphasis on 5th through 7th grades, an effort we have already begun. In addition, these data demonstrate the need for us to make district-wide improvements in several critical areas, including increasing the amount of instructional time, refocusing our staff development efforts, and redefining the role of supervisory and administrative staff from an evaluative to an instructional support function in the schools.

Focus on Improvement in the City's High Schools

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 16):

- Teachers will implement the district curriculum for ninth graders, which has been aligned to NJCCCS and the HSPA.
- Extend school day to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.
- Monitor Extended Day classes and student attendance closely by assigning a staff member to work with head teachers and visit school sites to determine quality of the programs and numbers of students being served.
- Continue to expand Liberty Alternative High School by admitting fifty (50) 9th graders per year.
- Provide ongoing staff development during the summer of 2001 and extending throughout the school year in reading, writing, math and science with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas.
- Expose math teachers to the most recently approved techniques of effective math teaching through participation in classes provided by Eisenhower grant funding.
- Continue to provide the same staff development opportunities regarding instructional strategies to general education and special education teachers alike. Special education supervisors will be responsible for the same staff support as the regular education supervisors.
- Continue to provide staff development to familiarize all staff members with test specifications, rubrics, test preparation materials and effective instructional strategies.
- Continue assignment of supervisors, who have the expertise and responsibility for the evaluation of staff, to department chairperson positions in the high schools. In addition to their responsibilities for observing instruction and evaluating staff, the department chairpersons also organize and present staff development workshops at the school site, as well as at conferences. They develop and distribute a monthly newsletter for all staff in their departments.

This newsletter directs attention to current developments in the field, instructional strategies and techniques, gives notice of current staff development opportunities and shares the accomplishments of students and staff.

- Continue assignment of department coordinators in the high schools. These individuals maintain a full teaching load and conduct coordinator job responsibilities before and after school or on their free time. Their responsibilities include assisting and providing materials to staff.
- Ensure and assess implementation of strategies and materials by assigning high school supervisors to classrooms at least two times a week.
- Supply teachers with reports of test analyses outlining deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills.
- Continue intensive 18-Day Plan, "Count Down to Success," and a "Continuation Plan" in each high school in all disciplines addressing the new HSPA proficiencies and test taking techniques.
- Monitor (school administrators) HSPA implementation on a daily basis.
- Provide all 9th and 10th grade students with a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments and continue the formal teaching of reading (which began last year) in the high schools. Provide 11th grade students with a similar opportunity.
- Secure signed contracts of agreement from parents/guardians and 11th grade at-risk students pledging the student's participation in HSPA academic support programs.
- Schedule 9th grade students in "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness based on the spring GEPA, previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection. Incoming 9th graders who did not take the GEPA in the spring will be placed in appropriate academic support classes based on teacher judgment, grades from their elementary schools and previous standardized tests.
- Mandate all at-risk 11th graders to attend HSPA Prep during one of the following: Extended Day classes, Super Saturday or HSPA Summer Institute based on the HSPT 11. Failure to attend will result in the student's assignment to the SRA process during the fall 2001 semester for an extended day (after school) period with no credit.

- Post test all 9th graders in March on an HSPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) to diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses linked to Extended Day, HSPA Prep, Super Saturday, or HSPA Summer Institute Program and to assist teachers in planning for developmental classes.
- Schedule 10th graders based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment, self-selection and end of Grade 9 HSPA practice test to attend the "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness.
- Implement measures to infuse reading across the curriculum based on analysis of test scores that have not indicated significant improvement on the HSPA. Language arts literacy electives (with emphasis on reading) will be scheduled for all at-risk tenth and eleventh graders.
- Provide teacher training on how to help students read effectively and improve comprehension of content area subjects.
- Implement Literacy Plans.

High School Task Force

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 20):

- A ten-credit English class incorporating public speaking and occurring in 80-minute blocks for the entire year with the same teacher will continue to be required for all 9th and some 10th graders in both general and special education classes.
- Review current ITV procedures for credit-bearing coursework.
- English and math orientation classes and other "remedial" electives were eliminated and proficiencies will continue to be addressed in the core curriculum classes.
- District weighting policy for summer school, magnet, honors, AP, college-level, special education, bilingual and home instruction courses will be continued.

- A six-week, four-hour day, summer school program will be provided for those students who did not pass any section of the HSPA. Any 12th grader who has not passed one or more sections of the HSPA and who does not attend a summer school program will be required to take an SRA course after school for no credit.
- Additional non-credit academic support classes will be phased in for all secondary students.
- A high school orientation program will be conducted for all incoming 9th graders before school begins in September so that students and their parents could:
 - meet key school staff members;
 - be informed of expectations, class requirements, extracurricular options, etc.; and,
 - make necessary scheduling revisions prior to the first day of school, etc.
- Conflict Resolution/Peer Mediation strategies and techniques within the health curriculum (taught by trained physical education/health teachers) will be continued.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Note: At the time of submission of this Report (8/29/02), finalized HSPA scores for the district had not yet been received.

On the high school level, most strategies designed to improve student progress were implemented. In addition, all teachers received updated curricula that were aligned to the NJCCCS. Ongoing staff development was provided using “skills plans” for HSPA preparation. Six courses were offered at NJCU for math teachers throughout the school year. Special education teachers were included in all staff development activities and provided the opportunity to attend course

offerings in math and science. However, Extended Day and Saturday Programs were reduced due to budgetary restrictions, and HSPA Practice for Language Arts was postponed until 10th grade.

The timely implementation of the above strategies was viewed as key to the overall improvement of instruction in the high schools. However, several of these were not completed as planned. Summer school was limited to students who failed courses, and rising seniors who were at risk of failing the HSPA. Additional non-credit academic support classes were not offered, and a planned high school orientation program, which was to be conducted for all incoming 9th graders, has been postponed until the opening of the 2002-03 school year.

The High School Task Force, in addition to monitoring the implementation of its 2001-02 strategies, has met to devise recommendations for additional steps to be taken to improve academic performance of high school students during 2002-03. Preliminary recommendations include modification of our extended block schedule by instituting a morning “zero period” and an afternoon “5th period,” each for 40 minutes, to accommodate the needs and demands of our student population. Also, 9th and 10th grade students in our comprehensive high schools will be placed into 5 or 10 credits of English and mathematics courses depending upon their levels of proficiency in these subjects. Finally, discussions have begun regarding expanded roles for guidance counselors, enrichment periods for students, and the introduction of a community service requirement for high school graduation.

Educational Technology Support Initiatives

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 22):

The district intends to research methods to improve the accuracy and reliability of student data entered and retrieved through our AS400 Student Information System.

As a result of these efforts, we expect to progress to the point that basic and testing data errors will be less than 5 percent of the total building population. As well, the rate of district-level errors will be under 5 percent. We further expect to maintain or increase this performance standard over the next five years.

To accomplish this task, the district will meet with school-level staff to identify policies and procedures to be implemented at the building level to improve the quality of the data in the system, and implement/monitor regular maintenance procedures to verify the accuracy of this data. The district will implement technology resources to improve and expand access to the data at the building level. As well, the district will continue to implement and monitor efficiency procedures to accurately report basic data, testing and other data necessary for district and State reports.

In addition to this new initiative, the district will continue to implement the successful strategies begun in previous years, including:

- Continue to implement district and school Technology Plans based on Whole School Reform models and NJ Core Curriculum Cross-Content/Workplace Readiness Standards.
- Infuse instructional technology throughout the curriculum. Currently, all schools are networked. Each high school has a minimum of fifty (50) networked classrooms.
- Continue training through the Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC) to ensure that every professional employee receives training. Continuing education in advanced skills will be on a volunteer basis.
- Ensure adherence to instructional technology standards and use of appropriate software by grade level across the curriculum.
- Follow district policy for expanded use of ITV which will allow courses from other high schools, colleges, Liberty Science Center, etc.
- Continue to support the seven professional development schools established in 2001-02 with a focus on technology across the curriculum.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The district has been very active in its support of all planned technology initiatives.

The Superintendent has directed central administrative staff to identify and eliminate constraints to the effective implementation of our planned district-wide Data Warehouse System. A vendor for the System has been selected (eScholar, Inc.), and a data cleansing procedure has been designed. As well, a senior staff level orientation has been conducted regarding data quality issues.

The district and all schools submitted building technology plans to the NJDOE as part of the whole school reform process. Schools have revised school-based budgets, and will revise technology plans as necessary to reflect those budgets. Each site-based management team will evaluate implementation of their building-based plan.

Projects linked to NJCCCS were documented at the building level in lesson plans, newsletters and “project fairs.” Monitoring of teachers’ technology use by district supervisors and administrators was reflected in evaluations, requests for professional development activities, and Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs).

Instructional technology continued to be infused throughout the curriculum. Teachers participated in curriculum integration staff development provided by the Educational Technology Training Center (ETTC). During the 2001-02 school year, approximately 800 teachers, 85 building administrators, and 75 central office personnel were provided in-service computer training during the school day. In addition, approximately 850 teachers received training by the ETTC in after-school sessions. The percent of our teachers at various skill levels is as follows: Beginner, 30%; Intermediate, 42%; Advanced, 20%; and, Instructor Level, 8%.

With the completion of installation of 250 computers in June, the district is now supporting 7,500 computers, bringing its student-to-multimedia computer ratio to 4.8 to 1. The percentage of classrooms with Internet connections is 99%.

Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 24):

- Revision of 5-Year Curriculum Cycle

The district has aligned all required courses with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS). Currently, new courses are being developed; electives and curricula are being revised by curriculum committees according to the district's "Five-Year Curriculum Cycle." All are being aligned with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS) and the New Jersey Cross-Content/Workforce Readiness Standards (NJCCWRS). Curriculum implementation is measured by student success on district and State assessments.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The district has aligned all required courses with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS). Currently, new courses are being developed, electives continue to be revised, and curricula being revised by curriculum committees according to the district's "Five-Year Curriculum Cycle" are all being aligned with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJCCCS) and the New Jersey Cross-Content/Workforce Readiness Standards (NJCCWRS). Curriculum implementation is measured by student success on district and State assessments. School-by-school results can be found in Appendices A, B and C beginning on page 147.

Extended Day/Super Saturdays

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 25):

- Continue extended day programs to provide an opportunity for students to participate in small group innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program and to address deficiencies noted after careful diagnostic and interim test analysis.
- Continue “Super Saturday Program” at five elementary schools, available to all district students (based on projected enrollments). Low staff/student ratio will provide for individualization of instruction. Because of low participation rates for HSPT preparation, this component of the program is being reviewed for the HSPA for 2001-02.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Extended Day was held in the elementary and high schools and focused on the improvement of language arts literacy, mathematics and science on the ESPA, GEPA and HSPA.

While we have not yet developed the technological capability to accurately evaluate the impact of our Extended Day Programs on student performance, anecdotal evidence from students and teachers indicates that these efforts are a worthwhile adjunct to the regular instructional day.

Super Saturdays was not funded and, therefore, unable to be implemented. For 2002-03, Super Saturdays will not be continued.

Plan for Expansion of Implementation of World Languages

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 27):

- Expand World Languages instruction to grades 1 and 8. Include: continuation of a World Language Task Force; recruitment of additional teachers; development of curriculum; purchase of materials; and, training of teachers during the school year and during a summer institute.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Our World Languages Program has been successfully expanded to grades 1 and 8. Report card grades for all participating students are available for review at each school.

Grade-level curriculum was written and implemented. Teachers were hired to cover all of the class periods needed across schools. Some teachers taught in more than one school (on different days) in order to implement the program effectively in all grades, 1-8.

Ongoing training was provided during the year, after school, and on Saturdays. Additionally, many teachers participated in the Global Education Summer Institute held at FDU for two days. Certificates of participation were provided to the participating teachers.

Continuation/Implementation of Reading Recovery Program

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 28):

- Seventy-six (76) Reading Recovery teachers are assigned to address the needs of the elementary schools for the 2001-02 school year.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Our Reading Recovery Program has been highly successful. The End-of-Program Status Report for the 2001-02 School Year from the National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC) indicates the following:

Percentage of Full-Program Reading Recovery Children Who Discontinued By Round (as of Monday, June 24, 2002)

Round	Full Program		
	Total	Discontinued	
	n	n	row %
First Round	241	117	49%
Second Round	192	184	96%
Subsequent Rounds	8	8	100%
Total	441	309	70%

**End-Of-Program Status of Reading Recovery Children By Round
(as of Monday, June 24, 2002)**

Round	End-Of-Program Status										Total
	Discontinued		Recommended		Incomplete		Moved		None of Above		
	n	row %	n	row %	n	row %	n	row %	n	row %	
First Round	117	41%	122	43%	0	0%	16	6%	29	10%	284
Second Round	184	66%	8	3%	74	26%	12	4%	2	1%	280
Subsequent Rounds	8	57%	0	0%	6	43%	0	0%	0	0%	14
TOTAL	309	54%	130	22%	80	14%	28	5%	31	5%	578

In addition, a follow-up study of our Reading Recovery students in grades 2 and 3 indicates that, by grade 3, former Reading Recovery students performed as well as, or better than, a randomly selected comparison group at the same grade level. Those results follow:

**2001-02
GRADE 2 FOLLOW-UP STUDY**

TEXT READING LEVEL	Highest Level At/Or Above 90%	Grade Level Equivalent
Reading Recovery Students (n=61)	25.2	3.2
Randomly Selected Comparison Group (n=52)	25.7	3.2

SLOSSON ORAL READING TEST	Raw Score	Grade Equivalent
Reading Recovery Students (n=61)	72.4	2.7
Randomly Selected Comparison Group (n=52)	80.5	3.0

GRADE 3 FOLLOW-UP STUDY

TEXT READING LEVEL	Highest Level At/Or Above 90%	Grade Level Equivalent
Reading Recovery Students (n=39)	29.6	5
Randomly Selected Comparison Group (n=53)	28.1	5

SLOSSON ORAL READING TEST	Raw Score	Grade Equivalent
Reading Recovery Students (n=39)	103.2	3.8
Randomly Selected Comparison Group (n=53)	101	3.8

Alternative Education

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 29):

- Continue implementation and expansion of our alternative education programs and strategies to address the needs of the at-risk population in the Jersey City Public Schools. These programs will include: Academy I; Academy II; Zero Tolerance Alternative Programs, “*Better Choices*,” and, “*fifteen together*”/PACE, and other Zero Tolerance Alternative Programs in grades K-5 and 6-12, and our newly established “Twilight Program.”
- Continue activities of the Parent Advisory Group for the 2001-02 school year for the “*fifteen together*”/PACE program, comprised of parents representing every high school.
- Continue “*fifteen together*”/PACE Program with general education and special education students who may be at risk of dropping out as an educational summer program and freshman mentorship high school program. Graduating grade 8 special needs students will meet with present freshman students to participate in a paid summer educational experience and an extended day after-school experience.
- Continue to offer an interim inclusive alternative educational setting for students whose educational program is being addressed by the CST because of their involvement in Zero Tolerance infractions. This will assist in minimizing students on home instruction. Teachers and teacher assistants will serve groups no larger than 8 students.
- Zero Tolerance and “*Better Choices*” staff, along with CSTs, will continue training to help them deal with their students on a daily basis.
- Expand Liberty Alternative High School to service fifty (50) 9th graders, fifty (50) 10th graders, and fifty (50) 11th graders until 200 students are accepted over a 4-year period.
- The Jersey City Public Schools’ new high school Twilight Program will open its doors to welcome students in September 2001. The alternative program will be ready to accept 50-60 students in each of our comprehensive high schools: Dickinson, Ferris, Lincoln and Snyder, who present a likely risk of dropping out of school before graduation. School for students in the Twilight Program will begin at 3:30 p.m. and end at 8 p.m. Students selected will attend school in their home high school.

Parents will be involved in a counseling meeting regarding reasons why referral to the Twilight Program is recommended and given an opportunity to take part in the decision. It is anticipated that, since parents want their children to succeed, most parents will be in favor of this new opportunity.

The students will be immersed in a project-centered environment with mastery based on course proficiencies. The student ratio will be 12:1. New Jersey Core Curriculum Content and Workplace Readiness Standards will be addressed through the project-based model of instruction. Students will also be placed in work situations as part of their career readiness curriculum, whenever possible.

Each site will have a head teacher and a number of content teachers. Support staff will include a full-time guidance counselor, a half-time social worker and a nurse. All staff will work closely together to provide students with another chance to complete their education and receive a high school diploma. Our students deserve another chance, and the Jersey City Public Schools will provide that opportunity.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All strategies were implemented as planned. In addition, certain programs exceeded expectations.

- Our Substance Awareness Program—which provides information to school staff, arranges medical screening, contacts parents in a confidential manner—provided services for up to 2300 students through 6 Substance Awareness Coordinators.
- Our Attendance Program—which enforces Attendance Policy, notifies parents of student absences, provides assistance to parents and refers family to appropriate support staff—served over 3500 families this year through 30 Community Aides and 2 Truancy Task Force vans.

- Our Home Instruction Program—which provides temporary limited instruction to children facing medical issues or demonstrating dangerous or disruptive behaviors in school and offers stability for families during crisis periods—served over 373 students through 158 Home Instruction teachers.
- Our fifteen together/PACE Program—which mentors 9th and 10th grade general and special education students; encourages personal and academic growth; provides opportunities for enriching service projects; and, fosters parental communication and involvement—resulted in over 4600 parental contacts this year and over 650 students mentored through 60 Mentor Counselors.
- Our School-Based Health Clinics—which provides on-site free or low-cost health services and offers various support groups for adolescent issues to our student population—provided over 825 student contacts during the past school year.
- Our Zero Tolerance/Better Choices Program—which provided a temporary alternative setting for students who act out and misbehave to the extent that they become a danger to themselves and others, and provided extraordinary support services to assist in reentry into the general population—served 399 students this year in 6 classrooms at 2 sites.
- Our Twilight Program had 60 students enrolled at four sites by the 3rd trimester of the 2001-02 school year. Forty-three graduates received standard high school diplomas, and another 12 need only complete the HSPA/SRA. Program hours were changed to 3:20 p.m. to 8:15 p.m. to reflect the 4-hour instructional time period required by code. Parents were involved, as appropriate, in both counseling and student conferences with teachers and other staff members.

Staff Development Programs

HSPA, GEPA and ESPA Staff Development

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 31):

District supervisors will continue to:

- Provide staff development during the summer of 2001 and extending throughout the school year across the district (particularly in the high schools) in Reading, Writing, Math, Science with special focus on ways to teach reading of all text types in all subject areas;
- Review test specifications;
- Explain use of various rubrics;
- Provide appropriate test preparation materials;
- Demonstrate how effective strategies, particularly reading strategies, may be incorporated into the everyday curriculum during ongoing workshops;
- Analyze and prepare reports for teachers regarding deficiencies in their school's results on particular text types and math and writing skills.

Vice principals will continue to:

- Monitor HSPA implementation in their assigned content areas on a daily basis and submit weekly reports to the principal.

Every 9th grade student will continue to use a 1999 Prentice Hall anthology in ten-credit English course that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments. Every 10th and 11th grade student will use a 2000 Prentice Hall anthology in English course that is aligned to the NJCCCS and State assessments.

Staff Development Linked to Supervision

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 36):

Staff development opportunities will continue to be developed as a result of supervision and instruction. This needs assessment will result in an expansion of the traditional forms of professional development into a comprehensive, ongoing program closely linked to district- and school-level educational plans, New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards,

and student performance standards. Means of providing ongoing professional development include seminars and a Teacher Academy.

Administrative Staff Development

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 37):

- **Principal Mentoring Program**

The program will continue to provide novice and veteran building principals with intensive, high-level, one-on-one personal and professional support they can rely upon to meet the challenge of their critical positions in the schools and develop into effective, successful school leaders. The mentor in this program will be referred to as the principal's associate. The associate will truly act as a partner or professional companion of the principal. The mentor will be working with and supporting the efforts of the principal in action, on the job throughout the school year from September until May.

- **Administrative Internship Program**

A Supportive Administrative Intern will work with a district supervisor, a building athletic director or other supervisory personnel for five (5) hours per week beyond the regular school day, while a School Administrative Intern will work with a building-level administrator for five (5) hours per week before school, during preparation periods and beyond the regular school day. The Supportive Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in two or three of the following areas; the School Administrative Intern performs a specific comprehensive duty in each of the following areas:

- Curriculum development;
- Student management;
- Parent/community relations;
- School organization and management.

- **Principals' Institute/Institute for Instructional Leadership**

This program will provide the opportunity for those staff members who are interested in becoming principals with training and exposure to the demands of an administrative position. Models for effective and dynamic administrators will be studied. As well, new principals will be given opportunities for growth at nearby universities, and all principals are apprised of workshops to address their individual needs.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

Program Strengths

The entire process of professional development was made part of the schools' and district culture and not something peripheral. That summarizes the success of the Jersey City Public Schools' professional development plan over the course of the 2001-02 school year.

The district, through the Local Professional Development Committee, based professional development initiatives on several essential components as it has worked to develop, implement and continually move the district's Professional Development Program forward. We put forth expectations, initiatives and activities that:

- Use clear, agreed-upon student achievement goals to focus and shape professional development opportunities and professional growth of teachers (both at the school and district levels);
- Provide an expanded array of professional development opportunities;
- Embed ongoing, informal and formal learning into the school and district culture;
- Build highly collaborative school and district environments where working together to solve problems and to learn from each other became "the norm";
- Find and use time to allow and encourage teacher professional growth and development to happen; and,
- Keep checking a broad range of student performance data.

These goals grew out of an intensive, collaborative process of analyzing feedback and assisting schools, school teams, in "looking at where they were and how students are performing across the curriculum and in content areas tested by the ESPA, GEPA or HSPT/HSPA" as well as looking at the schools' professional development goals, and then formulating with them goals for "where the school wants to go." Since each school has selected a Whole School Reform model and

completed a thorough and ongoing needs assessment based on the nine elements of Whole School Reform, including improving student achievement, professional development, parental and community input, and school climate, the school's SMT was able to clearly identify and define areas for professional growth related to student performance and their other needs. Using test results and student data to identify specific areas for improvement, the schools selected or designed interventions to help tackle them.

During the 2001-02 school year, the number of teachers and other instructional staff members participating in different committees at the district and school levels has significantly increased. With the inception of WSR, and based on the creation and participation on the School Management Teams, WSR design teams, school-level committees, action research groups, etc., teachers have a new and deeper understanding of school needs and an ownership of solutions at the building level. Similarly, at the district level, ESPA, GEPA and HSPT/HSPA Focus Groups, the Assessment Committee, Promotional Policy Committee, etc. in conjunction with specialized curriculum committees that developed plans for ESPA, GEPA and HSPT/HSPA preparation gave numerous teachers at critical grade levels additional input and brought forth various plans for implementation that were successful. Participating teachers shared and discussed their learnings with colleagues and that networking and support encouraged a new sense of collaboration and collegiality throughout the district. This is a paradigm change and has contributed greatly to the success of many connected professional development activities.

One example of our success is manifested in the fact that the district sponsored a new professional development experience in August/September 2001, entitled "September Survival," for the first time so as to support our more than 500 newly hired teaching staff members. A three-day new teacher orientation was held in August followed up by "September Survival Workshops" after school every day in September 2001, beginning with the first day of school...even on Fridays. The workshops covered an array of topics that would assist new teachers in getting off to a very solid start. More than 450 new teachers participated in the district's three full days of New Teacher Orientation in late August. More than 250 new teachers signed up for and participated in more than 1000 "September Survival Workshops."

Additionally, the district held an Opening Day Convocation at the Continental Arena in East Rutherford, New Jersey, on September 5, 2001. The Superintendent's Convocation featured a nationally prominent keynote speaker who focused her presentation on commitment and motivation of teachers to excel in their work with students on a daily basis. The morning was a strategic and highly successful endeavor in which to provide more than 5000 instructional staff members with a motivational and meaningful professional development experience. It set the tone and the educational expectations for the 2001-02 school year for all instructional staff.

The State's 100 Hours of Continuing Education mandate has also provided a new incentive for teacher participation in workshops, institutes and other professional development experiences scheduled after work hours and on weekends. More teachers than ever have attended district-sponsored and school-sponsored workshops during the 2001-02 school year. The district also sponsored workshops in language arts literacy and mathematics for teachers in grades Pre-K through 6 on Saturdays. More than 145 teachers attended the language arts series for 4 or more full days on consecutive Saturdays. More than 35 teachers (the maximum able to be accommodated by the consultant) participated in the ESPA and GEPA mathematics strategies workshop series held on the same Saturdays. Finally, 2001-02 saw the implementation of our ECLIPSE! Program, designed for aspiring administrators and supervisors.

ECLIPSE! included the following required components for all participants:

Opening Reception/Seminar – This introductory experience opened with a networking exchange as well as presentations and sessions relating to defining and exploring leadership, school improvement and change. Participants began to develop a professional portfolio and heard from experienced, effective practicing administrators.

Leadership Forum Series – Regularly scheduled sessions explored critical issues related to effective school and district administration, including creating a vision, goal setting, communication with students/staff/community members, understanding the structures, organizational and social networks that shape school and district policies, procedures and practices that contribute directly to student learning, accountability demands, developing partnerships and improving student achievement. This preparation will help candidates gain greater knowledge of a variety of areas, as well as leadership skills and styles, and enable the networking and interaction between colleagues. The forums were scheduled for 30 hours (15 weeks on Tuesdays from 3:45 – 6:00 p.m.).

Administrative Internship – The required principal/supervisory internship linked training with hands-on experience in leadership for student learning on a regularly scheduled basis and fostered collaboration with effective practicing administrators to attain on-the-job experience. The internship experience, either in school administration or district administration (supervision), was arranged with experienced district principals, directors and supervisors serving as mentors—at times outside regular working hours. The internship encompassed 75 hours beyond assigned hours (5 hours per week from February 11 through May 31, 2002).

Throughout the many initiatives, and based on the district's plan, professional development has achieved a renewed status in the past two years. More than 1000 new teaching staff members have been hired during that time. Professional development initiatives and opportunities have been well received, well supported, well attended and positively evaluated.

The district has supported expert outside consultants as well as developing a cadre of in-district teacher presenters to provide the quality experiences that our staff members expect. The district was cognizant of providing only “top-notch” experiences so that continual and ongoing participation would be encouraged. The district was cognizant of having “boring, meaningless and one-shot” workshops as a way of destroying this renewed confidence and participation and was diligent in not offering that variety of experiences. This contributed to our overall success.

The district is excited and enthusiastic as we continue building upon the successes achieved in the 2001-02 school year. The Local Professional Development Committee, in conjunction with the district’s Staff Developers, supervisors and administrators are developing very innovative and meaningful experiences to meet the varied needs of our professional staff.

Program Challenges

Improved job performance, changes in school organization and routines, and improved student learning are concrete indicators of the effectiveness of our personal professional growth and development. The district’s Professional Development Plan has as its goal the continual growth and improvement of our schools, and our district, as well as improving performance of students and staff.

Perhaps the toughest challenge in district-wide and school-wide improvement is keeping the organizational eye fixed squarely on the prize. Change efforts often become diluted or sidetracked because of new State mandates, new district initiatives, a changed focus, or for a lack of relentlessness about staying the course, about sustaining momentum, about keeping the commitment alive and focuses on the concrete student performance goals we set out to achieve. The challenge for the district, through its Local Professional Development Committee, is to maintain a strong focus and intensive momentum, so that quality professional development experiences are offered equitably across the district, consistently across schools and on an ongoing basis so as to reach every possible participant. This is a challenge based on the size of the district...across 39 schools with thousands of instructional staff members.

The factors related to the ongoing challenges of providing effective and job-embedded opportunities for all instructional staff members in all of our schools are several. The sheer size of the instructional staff population requires that it be managed effectively and on an ongoing basis—every day. The continuous scheduling efforts require a huge clerical commitment and time allocation. Identifying and securing precious space is always an issue...required permit parking in many areas of the city adds to the situation at some sites. Additionally, the acquisition and assignment of substitute teachers to cover classes for teachers to attend opportunities during the school day has been less than adequate during

the past two school years—due to the teacher shortage being experienced by all school districts. Finally, teacher mobility and teacher retirements have begun to impact the district, necessitating the hiring of large numbers of new teachers. During both the 2000-01 and the 2001-02 school years, more than 500 new teachers were hired each September. Additional new staff members continued to be hired throughout the year to fill vacancies. The challenge is to support these cadres of teachers so that they may begin a successful teaching experience.

The district has been and will continue to be vigilant and creative in offering all instructional staff members a high quality professional development component related to their professional growth and professional needs. We are empowered by our past successes and look forward to providing a quality professional development experience so that the district's goal of improving student achievement can become a reality.

Corrective Action School-Level Plans

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 33):

- Corrective Action Plans developed as a result of initial visits by the Associate Superintendent were implemented during the 2000-01 school year, and will be incorporated into each school's WSR planning process for 2001-02.
- The focus of school visits for 2001-02 will be to provide support and technical assistance to each school as they implement their school-level plans.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The system of "Corrective Action" visits to each school was not continued during the 2001-02 school year. However, certain useful and appropriate elements of Corrective Action Plans initially developed during the 2000-01 school year were incorporated into WSR school-level plans in each building.

Improvement of Lowest Performing Elementary Students

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 34):

- Based on multiple measures, it will be recommended that 4th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday classes and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on spring ESPA, it will be recommended that 5th grade students identified as at risk attend ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday and/or ESPA Summer Institute.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grades 3 and 6 will attend the "Extended Day" program to focus on areas of weakness (reading, writing, math and science).
- Based on a fall GEPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) and teacher judgment, 8th grade students identified as at risk must attend GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes and/or Super Saturday programs to ensure graduation.
- Based on the previous year's final grades, January district mid-term exams, teacher judgment and self-selection, students in grade 7 will attend the GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes, Super Saturday and/or GEPA Summer Institute to focus on areas of weakness.
- By October 2001, guidance counselors will meet with 4th and 8th grade at-risk students and their parents/guardians to secure signed contracts of agreement to participate in ESPA and GEPA academic support programs.
- Use of ESPA/GEPA Plans developed by district supervisors.
- Administration of a practice ESPA/GEPA downloaded from the NJDOE website.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

There was no Super Saturdays Program available in 2001-02, and no elementary summer school as a result of budget cuts. ESPA Prep during Extended Day classes was done on a school-level basis.

The Fall GEPA practice test (The Learning Consortium) was not given. We did not use this company's materials. In its place, we used the NJDOE "GEPA" Rehearsal Test. Tests were scored by teachers according to guidelines provided by the State. On that basis, students were recommended to Extended Day.

Students in grade 7 attended the GEPA Prep during Extended Day classes. Students were recommended at the school level. Participation was voluntary.

Daily plans for ESPA/GEPA were developed beginning with the first week of school in September 2001. Activities were conducted in Reading, Math, Writing, Science and Social Studies. Activities continued through the school year until March/May 2002.

Support by Administrative Staff

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 39):

- Supervisors will be assigned an average of fifty staff evaluations during the course of the school year. Each supervisor will cooperatively develop weekly schedules that reflect assignments to particular schools on a full-time basis during school hours. The combination of these evaluations and support activities will provide teachers with the assistance required to effectuate successful delivery of instruction.
- Supervisors and department coordinators will continue to work collaboratively to ensure that staff in respective disciplines receive the support, materials, and technical assistance necessary to implement the curriculum.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All supervisory activities to support the instructional process were completed as planned. Additionally, supervisors were required to complete a minimum of 40 support activities related to improvement of instruction.

SECTION II: COMPLIANCE

INDICATOR #5.1: PUPIL ATTENDANCE

INDICATOR #5.2: DROPOUTS

INDICATOR #7.1: STATE AID

INDICATOR #7.2: GENERALLY ACCEPTED ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES (GAAP)

INDICATOR #7.3: OVEREXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

INDICATOR #7.4: ANNUAL AUDIT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INDICATOR #7.5: TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS

INDICATOR #7.6: HEALTH AND SAFETY

INDICATOR #7.7: COMPREHENSIVE MAINTENANCE PLAN

Compliant ☒ (All listed Indicators)

Noncompliant ☐

**Explanation of Obstacles Encountered
and
Progress in Past Year in Addressing Them:**

Not applicable. We continue to successfully implement all CAPs in these areas.

Strategies for Improvement:

Although all Indicators have been satisfied, we continue to monitor activities to sustain compliance status.

Staff Taking the Lead & Projected Timelines:

All Indicators are being addressed in appropriate departments. All timelines for continued compliance are being met.

INDICATOR #7.8 FACILITY MASTER PLAN/ SUBSTANDARD CLASSROOMS

Compliant ☐

Noncompliant ☒

**Explanation of Obstacles Encountered
and
Progress in Past Year in Addressing Them:**

Land acquisition and procurement of professional services and contractors are now conducted by NJEDA on behalf of the district. Obstacles have been encountered in the ability of NJEDA to acquire land for projects projected in the FMP. Also, NJEDA's procurement of design and consulting services appears to be extremely slow resulting in protracted schedules for procurement necessary for land and consulting services.

Strategies for Improvement:

The district's goal is to eliminate all substandard spaces. The Facilities Master Plan submitted to the Department of Education in the spring of 1999 does not include these spaces. As the FMP is implemented, the district's goal will be realized. During the implementation of the FMP, we will continue to seek approval of the County Office for leased classrooms. The district will be working with NJEDA to acquire additional sites needed for the implementation of the FMP.

The district continues to lease classroom space due to overcrowding. Additionally, with the Abbott preschool mandate, the district also leases forty-nine (49) trailers for the preschool program for four-year olds. Eight (8) additional trailer classrooms were provided by NJEDA in September 2001. These trailers have virtually eliminated the little outdoor space available on many school sites. A copy of all leased space and the purpose for each is on file in the Business Administrator's Office.

INDICATOR #7.8 FACILITY MASTER PLAN/ SUBSTANDARD CLASSROOMS (continued)

The Facilities Management Plan includes thirty (30) new schools. Fifteen (15) of these are Early Childhood Centers. The FMP was approved in February 2001. By the end of 2001, the district had set forth forty-two (42) first-year priorities and submitted project requests to NJDOE for each. Twenty-six (26) of the project priorities are land or building acquisition; three (3) are for new schools; four (4) are for comprehensive renovations/additions at existing schools; eight (8) are for renovations of particular systems/equipment; one (1) was for additional temporary classrooms for preschool.

Project numbers have been assigned by NJDOE for the priority projects, and all of these projects were transferred from NJDOE to NJEDA for implementation. Of the forty-two (42) first-year priority projects, progress as of July 2002 follows:

- Twenty-six (26) land acquisition projects—NJEDA has acquired no property, but is conducting preliminary studies on four (4) of the potential sites identified by the district. The NJEDA has also approved grant agreements for the purchase of P.S. 42, a leased building, and land for the Heights Middle School.
- Three (3) new school projects—All three (3) projects are currently being designed by NJEDA consultants and are scheduled for construction in 2003.
- Four (4) comprehensive renovations/additions—One (1) project is currently being designed by NJEDA consultants and is scheduled for construction in 2003.
- Eight (8) renovations—No contracts for design of this work have been awarded by NJEDA.
- One (1) project for additional temporary classrooms for preschool—This project is complete. Eight (8) preschool trailer classrooms were installed by NJEDA in September 2001.

Although NJEDA will probably complete all Health and Safety work by the end of 2003, overall progress towards addressing the district's substandard facilities is slow. By September 2002, the district will set second-year priorities. NJEDA land acquisition for year-one priorities will not be complete by that time. The availability of land will play a critical role in the NJEDA's ability to complete the district's year-two building and renovation priorities.

We will not be compliant until all leased spaces are abandoned with all trailers removed from school sites and the new schools that make up the district's Facilities Management Plan have been built.

INDICATOR #7.8
FACILITY MASTER PLAN/
SUBSTANDARD CLASSROOMS (continued)

Staff Taking the Lead & Projected Timelines:

Facilities Director, Business Administrator

INDICATOR #8.1(e) SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Compliant ☐

Noncompliant ☒

**Explanation of Obstacles Encountered
and
Progress in Past Year in Addressing Them:**

The district had intended to hire an Internal Compliance Officer to provide the administrative oversight for all activities of our Special Education Corrective Action Plan. This did not occur. In addition, budget constraints resulted in our inability to hire additional supervisory personnel necessary to monitor our compliance efforts.

Strategies for Improvement:

In response to the May 2001 Monitoring Report (received in September 2001), the district developed all required CAPs, presented them for Board of Education approval, and submitted them to the NJDOE and the Hudson County Office in November 2001. Specific activities and timelines were included to ensure the prompt correction of all areas of need identified in the report of monitoring findings. In response, the NJDOE requested several revisions to the Plan (memo of January 3, 2002), and these were developed and submitted by the district on January 24, 2002. This document includes all strategies for improvement that have been planned to address the CAP. To date, we have received no formal approval from the NJDOE regarding this submission. Still, despite the lack of additional administrative and supervisory personnel, the district was able to move ahead in an effective manner to address items included in our Corrective Action Plan.

The status of other Corrective Action Plans that were previously in effect follows:

INDICATOR #8.1(e)

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES *(continued)*

- District-Wide Inclusion Education Plan: We continue to focus on making every school an inclusive education site by providing a full continuum of resource program services in each building, ensuring that students have the opportunity to be educated in the least restrictive environment as mandated by both State and federal code. Many school-level inclusion plans have made provisions for an inclusion teacher at every grade, and the district is moving in this direction district wide. In addition to the expansion of the Resource Program, special education students are being supported in their general education programs through the assistance of Project Raise, the Behavioral Support Program, the Adapted Physical Education Program and the Art Therapy Program. Also, we have participated this year in the State-funded LRE Capacity Building Project. At P.S. Nos. 6, 9, 29 and 30, we have been able to build sufficient capacity to have forty (40) of our special education students returned to their home schools by September 2002. As well, we have established a district-wide capacity building team to provide support to our general education classes as special education students are included in those classes. A staff of six (6), consisting of two (2) instructional inclusion specialists and four (4) intervention specialists have been assigned to the project.
- Special Education Reading Program: The special education literacy program, Project Raise, is now implemented in nine (9) elementary and five (5) high schools throughout the district. Five (5) of the schools have twenty-five (25) or more students receiving services from the reading specialists. The program has grown to include nine (9) reading teachers.
- Preschool Inclusion Plan: The Adapted Physical Education Program is an outgrowth of the district-wide Preschool Inclusion Plan. It provides preschool students with developmentally appropriate fine and gross motor skill development. Services are provided to preschoolers in the following settings: general education, co-teaching (general and special education), preschool disabilities special classes and inclusion. The district provides two (2) Adapted Physical Education teachers who currently service fifty-one (51) classrooms distributed across thirteen (13) buildings. The program incorporates parental involvement for skill development and enhancement.
- Behavioral Support Program: A cadre of trained Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW) provide counseling, support and consultation services to students currently enrolled in district level (school based) Behavioral Disabilities and Multiple Disabilities special classes. School staff and the parents of the students are included in the delivery of services model. This program allows students with significant emotional problems to remain in general education

INDICATOR #8.1(e)

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES *(continued)*

buildings with the possibility of increased inclusion experiences. The aim of the program is also to reduce the suspension rate of these special education students while teaching them appropriate adaptive/social/coping skills so that they can function in a general education program. Ten (10) LCSWs are providing services in eighteen (18) schools, each LCSW is typically assigned four (4) to five (5) special classes.

- Art Therapy Program: Art therapy services are provided to both special education and general education students in six (6) schools throughout the district. The focus of this program is to develop emotional awareness and coping skills for students with a history of poor emotional expression skills. Students are provided an opportunity to release pent-up feelings in a constructive manner, increasing their success in a general education building.
- District-wide Suspension CAP: The district was required to develop a Corrective Action Plan to ensure that special education students' rights would not be abridged by exceeding the ten-day suspension limit without IEP intervention. The CAP requires that the cumulative number of suspension days be maintained and monitored for all special education students. This is achieved by including this information on the Suspension Report Form and the Cumulative Suspension Report for Special Education Students Form. The latter is maintained in the student's main special education file. The CAP requires that the principal confer with the CST case manager prior to instituting any additional suspensions once the student has amassed seven (7) days of suspension per school year. Training on this issue has been provided to all principals and Child Study Team members (including Speech/Language Specialist). As well, we now have three (3) alternative education settings consisting of three (3) classrooms for approximately twenty-five (25) students in operation to service children who would otherwise be excluded from school.

Staff Taking the Lead & Projected Timelines:

Staff involved in implementing the revised Improvement Plan are identified within the Plan, as are timelines for completion.

Summary Student Behavior Indicators

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)												
School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)						3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE			2001-02 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99	For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00	For: 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01			
P.S. #1		88.3	87.7	91.3	93.2	92.8	88.0 ^a	89.1	90.7	90.7	92.4	1.7
P.S. #3	93.6	93.9	92.2	94.8	95.6	95.5	93.2	93.6	94.2	94.2	95.3	1.1
P.S. #5	94.4	95.0	92.3	95.4	95.8	95.5	93.9	94.2	94.5	94.5	95.6	1.1
P.S. #6	93.5	94.1	94.0	95.4	95.4	95.3	93.9	94.5	94.9	94.9	95.4	0.5
P.S. #8	92.3	93.0	91.0	94.2	93.7	93.6	92.1	92.7	93.0	93.0	93.8	0.8
P.S. #9	91.4	91.7	89.2	93.2	93.1	93.6	90.8	91.4	91.8	91.8	93.3	1.5
P.S. #11	93.2	93.9	91.3	94.7	94.8	95.1	92.8	93.3	93.6	93.6	94.9	1.3
P.S. #12	92.0	90.7	89.6	91.6	93.0	94.0	90.8	90.6	91.4	91.4	92.9	1.5
P.S. #14	92.6	92.0	88.0	91.9	91.7	92.9	90.9	90.6	90.5	91.6	92.2	0.6
P.S. #15	91.4	92.4	91.0	92.2	92.9	92.8	91.6	91.9	92.0	92.0	92.6	0.6
P.S. #16	93.1	94.3	93.1	95.5	95.2	95.5	93.5	94.3	94.6	94.6	95.4	0.8
P.S. #17	94.0	94.0	92.9	93.9	94.2	94.8	93.6	93.6	93.7	93.8	94.3	0.5
P.S. #20	93.7	92.4	90.2	94.0	93.7	94.3	92.1	92.2	92.6	92.8	94.0	1.2
P.S. #22	93.1	91.6	91.2	92.7	92.5	93.0	92.0	91.8	92.1	92.1	92.7	0.6
P.S. #23	92.0	93.1	91.0	93.1	93.1	93.9	92.0	92.4	92.4	92.4	93.4	1.0
P.S. #24	92.4	91.6	89.7	93.5	93.5	93.7	91.2	91.6	92.2	92.2	93.6	1.4
P.S. #25	94.7	94.9	92.6	95.3	95.9	95.6	94.1	94.3	94.6	94.7	95.6	0.9
P.S. #27	94.9	94.8	93.1	95.7	95.5	95.4	94.3	94.5	94.8	94.8	95.5	0.7
P.S. #28	93.5	93.9	91.9	94.6	93.8	95.1	93.1	93.5	93.4	93.6	94.5	0.9
P.S. #29	92.0	92.3	90.4	93.4	92.7	91.1	91.6	92.0	92.2	92.2	92.4	0.2
P.S. #30	92.7	93.3	90.3	92.3	93.3	93.5	92.1	92.0	92.0	92.6	93.0	0.4
P.S. #31	87.9	87.2	84.0	90.2	91.9	94.0	86.4	87.1	88.7	90.0	92.0	2.0
P.S. #33	92.2	94.2	93.7	95.0	95.0	95.0	93.4	94.3	94.6	94.6	95.0	0.4
P.S. #34	92.0	92.6	90.6	93.1	94.0	94.3	91.7	92.1	92.6	92.6	93.8	1.2
P.S. #37	91.8	91.6	91.2	92.7	93.8	94.2	91.5	91.8	92.6	92.6	93.6	1.0

^aA 2-year average since, at the close of the 1998-99 school year, P.S. #1 had only been in existence for two years.

ATTENDANCE RATE (%)												
School	AVERAGE RATE AT YEAR END (6/30)						3-YEAR AVERAGE RATE			2001-02 3-Year Average Benchmark	Actual 3-Year Average For: 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	For: 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99	For: 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00	For: 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01			
P.S. #38	94.9	94.9	93.6	95.9	96.0	96.1	94.5	94.8	95.2	95.2	96.0	0.8
P.S. #39	91.0	89.7	87.8	91.6	93.1	93.5	89.5	89.7	90.8	90.8	92.7	1.9
P.S. #40	92.7	91.7	89.4	93.1	92.8	93.6	91.3	91.4	91.8	92.4	93.2	0.8
P.S. #41	92.1	92.1	90.0	92.9	92.8	93.9	91.4	91.7	91.9	91.9	93.2	1.3
P.S. #42	94.5	94.0	92.0	95.2	95.6	96.4	93.5	93.7	94.3	94.3	95.7	1.4
D.H.S.	84.0	84.7	83.1	91.0	90.8	90.7	83.9	86.3	88.3	90.0	90.8	0.8
F.H.S.	89.1	88.9	84.4	92.4	91.2	91.3	87.5	88.6	89.3	90.0	91.6	1.6
Liberty				93.9	91.7	93.7		N/A	92.8 ^b	92.8	93.1	0.3
L.H.S.	84.5	83.9	82.7	90.0	90.6	90.2	83.7	85.5	87.8	90.0	90.3	0.3
M.A.H.S.	97.0	96.8	95.9	97.7	97.3	96.9	96.6	96.8	97.0	97.0	97.3	0.3
S.H.S.	81.0	82.4	81.0	88.5	87.6	87.6	81.5	84.0	85.7	90.0	87.9	-2.1
R.D.S.	90.1	90.9	83.3	92.3	92.3	92.1	88.1	88.8	89.3	90.5	92.2	1.7
Academy I	92.3	91.4	89.7	92.9	93.7	94.7	91.1	91.3	92.1	92.1	93.8	1.7
Academy II			82.9	90.3	91.1	92.5	N/A	86.6 ^c	88.1	90.0	91.3	1.3
DISTRICT	91.3	91.4	89.5	93.2	93.3	93.5	90.7	91.4	92.0	92.0	93.3	1.3

^bA 2-year average since, at the close of the 2000-01 school year, Liberty Alternative High School had only been in existence for two years.

^cA 2-year average since, at the close of the 1999-00 school year, Academy II had only been in existence for two years.

DROPOUT RATE¹ (16-year olds & over)								
School	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #1		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #6	40.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #8	0.0	14.3	40.0	11.1	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #9	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #11	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	10.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #12	0.0	40.0	0.0	28.6	33.3	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #14	7.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #15	36.4	15.4	9.1	12.5	0.0	Maintain State Standard	33.3	-23.3
P.S. #16	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #17	8.7	8.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #20	25.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #22	0.0	8.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #23	20.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #24	40.0	10.0	12.5	0.0	18.2	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #25	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #27	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #28	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #30	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A

¹Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

DROPOUT RATE¹ (16-year olds & over)								
School	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #33	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
P.S. #34	20.0	20.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #37	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #38	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #39	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
P.S. #40	50.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	5.9	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #41	0.0	14.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
P.S. #42	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A (primary school)	N/A	N/A
D.H.S.	16.5	14.6	14.0	14.1	11.5	Meet State Standard	10.0	Met State Standard
F.H.S.	6.3	0.7	1.8	8.3	9.1	Maintain State Standard	7.5	Maintained State Standard
Liberty				0.0	1.5	Maintain State Standard	8.7	Maintained State Standard
L.H.S.	23.2	15.8	11.5	9.6	10.1	Meet State Standard	8.1	Met State Standard
M.A.H.S.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Maintain State Standard	0.0	Maintained State Standard
S.H.S.	17.3	9.2	10.1	11.2	10.6	Meet State Standard	15.7	-5.7
Academy I	37.5	10.0	21.4	10.5	5.9	Maintain State Standard	9.1	Maintained State Standard
Academy II			15.0	0.0	13.3	Meet State Standard	0.0	Met State Standard
DISTRICT	14.6	10.0	9.3	9.92	9.5	Maintain State Standard	9.4	Maintained State Standard

¹Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16-year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

**SECTION III:
ABBOTT IMPLEMENTATION**

IMPLEMENTATION OF 6A:24—URBAN EDUCATION REFORM REGULATIONS

Implementation of Whole School Reform

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 40):

- Schools and administrators will be provided with comprehensive technical assistance during the WSR planning and budget process this year. Weekly technical assistance meetings from September through November will include:
 - Early Childhood Plans/Budget – All Elementary Schools
 - High School Plans and Budget (State Technical Assistance with PIRC Staff)
 - Special Education Technical Assistance—Elementary and Secondary
 - Bilingual/ESL/World Languages Technical Assistance—Elementary and Secondary
 - NJDOE Videoconference on Technology Plans/School Technology Plan Technical Assistance
 - School Technology Plan/Budget Technical Assistance—Elementary and Secondary
 - District initiatives and School-Based Budgeting Technical Assistance—Elementary and Secondary
- Continue to provide appropriate training for SMTs.
- Hold meetings with SRI personnel assigned to the district to ensure ongoing communication.
- Act as a “broker” between schools and program developers.
- Continue to implement district-wide Accountability Plan, available for review at the district office.
- Assist schools with staff development plans.
- Foster a networking system by WSR models for all schools.
- Continue to implement the district’s Early Childhood Plan and Alternative Education Plans for middle and secondary school students in order to provide appropriate and educationally enriching learning situations at those grade levels.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

All schools have been surveyed regarding their WSR implementation status and barriers encountered, as well as strategies to address those barriers. A chart of those responses follows:

District-Wide Whole School Reform Implementation Barriers & Issues

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 1				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 3 3 rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: Public School #1 continues to successfully implement our WSR model Co-NECT. Our staff continues to follow the Co-NECT Benchmarks, Project-Based Learning, School-Level Plan and Literacy Plan. We have new computers (3 per classroom), software, printers, digital cameras and scanners in all classrooms for student use. We hosted a Critical Friends visit on March 25 and 26. During this visit, we received feedback on our WSR implementation.	Barriers encountered in implementation: We are in need of a computer lab for student use and for professional development training.	Strategies to Address Barriers: We are in the discussion stages of establishing a computer room for both student use and professional development. Central office approval, as well as funding, will be needed for its development.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 Mid-year 2 nd Cohort (2B) Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The Co-NECT model for Whole School Reform has had a positive impact on our school community during the 2001-02 school year. During the month of February, we hosted a Critical Friends Review. We were very pleased with the comments that were provided by the visiting educators. They were positive in their review and gave us some very valuable insights that our SMT will work with as they prepare our Action Plans for the 2002-03 school year. The Conwell School community was pleased to present a comprehensive school project fair in February and proudly welcomed parents and community members to celebrate the students' successful exposition of their work.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The barriers encountered in the Co-NECT implementation process can be directly related to our facility. The first problem relates to technology. Ten of our classes are housed in Annex rooms that have recently been connected to the Internet. It was necessary to use a dial up connection for these classes so they are not able to access the LAN network that the other schools in the district use. Many of the Co-NECT activities depend on internet access: (1) staff development modules; (2) project builder programs; (3) tele-collaboration with classes in other Co-NECT schools.	Strategies to Address Barriers: 1. The ten classes that are housed in Annex buildings are still experiencing difficulties with the dial-up connection to the Internet. Teachers have been given access to the computer room in the Main Building on Thursday and Friday when the Computer Literacy Teacher reports to another school. 2. Common planning time for each grade level has been scheduled at 8:10 a.m. Teachers have an opportunity to meet with

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3 (continued)				
			<p>The second barrier relates to common planning time for some of our teachers. Our school is spread across three blocks, and it is difficult for teachers to meet and use their time productively when a lot of time is spent moving students from building to building for special classes and programs.</p>	<p>grade-level staff for 20 minutes each day. Common planning will be scheduled for teachers working on the same grade level. Arrangements will be made whenever possible for teachers to have a resource area in the Main Building that can be used for grade-level meetings. We are scheduled for the construction of a new facility; this problem will not be eliminated until we are all housed in the same building.</p>
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: As a result of the first Co-NECT Critical Friends visit (conducted on February 11, 2002), the following strengths and challenges were identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partnerships with FDU and other community businesses, the establishment of the Parent Literacy Program, as well as the affiliation with the Puerto Rican Family Center shows an obvious commitment to the importance of community involvement. • Students are enthusiastically engaged in project work that includes a variety of disciplines, especially reading and writing. A range of cognitively rich learning 	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district's emphasis on using Pacing Charts inhibits the project-based learning process. • Breakdown and lack of technology equipment. • True understanding of PBL. 	Strategies to Address Barriers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-service training was provided to staff on the tenets of project-based learning. • Staff members attended Co-NECT mini sabbaticals to garner further knowledge to use for turnkey training. • Meetings were held to engage teachers in a discussion of project-based learning and its implementation in the classroom. • The Technology Coordinator and the Technology Teacher worked collaboratively to

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5 (continued)				
		<p>environments is evident by the commitment to cooperative learning, brainstorming, and other best practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of comprehensive assessment through the use of rubrics and a school-wide portfolio system. • School-based organizational teams are clearly goal oriented and working toward total school improvement. High expectations from the leadership teams are obvious. • The use of digital cameras, calculators, overhead projectors, videos and computers for instructional purposes is evident in projects displayed and some classroom instruction. 		<p>provide teachers with assistance and ensure the equipment was in working order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New printers, etc. were ordered and placed in classrooms with most need. • A technology room was established for teachers needing assistance. • Monies were allocated in the 2002-03 budget for new computers, etc. • Our Co-NECT facilitator will conduct curriculum mapping sessions in 2002-03 to ensure standards drive instruction and correlate to project-based learning.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 6				
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000		Status: Staff has had the opportunity to become knowledgeable about the Comer process and to develop and work on interactive committees/ subcommittees. There is a renewed commitment to improving and supporting teaching, and to facilitating the holistic development of students. Staff development that addresses the academic and developmental needs of the students remains ongoing.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Budget timelines and restrictions limited the flexibility to allocate resources effectively. The school-based budgeting process was a confusing and frustrating experience. More time is needed to adequately address and analyze school goals, objectives, and needs.	Strategies to Address Barriers: We continue to focus on improvement of the school-based budgeting process.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 8				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: We are completing our second year of Comer and have implemented subcommittees that are meeting regularly and have integrated the developmental pathways into our everyday teaching.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Due to matters beyond our control, we could not move ahead until December. We have so many new faculty members this year that it has been difficult to train everyone. With additional staff being trained this spring, we should be able to proceed.	Strategies to Address Barriers: P.S. #8 has identified the training of all staff members as the barrier we experienced in our second year of Comer. The following are the strategies we used and will use in the upcoming school year. We at P.S. #8 sent two sets of teachers for Comer Training at Yale. The teachers went up on two separate occasions. Each group spent a week being trained in Comer 101. Due to budgetary restraints this school year, we will use all previously trained staff to “turnkey” new staff members. We will rely more on our Comer Representative, Ken Hardy, to help in the training of new staff members as well as our Facilitator and SMPT members. We will have the training during the two faculty meetings a month. We are in compliance with all subcommittees with the exception of the Parent Team. We are addressing that with our Parent Council and have gotten more parents involved by having class representatives and workshops for the parents.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 9				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: The Kennedy School has reorganized the formation of SPMT subcommittees to meet our needs as identified by surveyed stakeholders. A system of documentation utilizing attendance sheets and meeting minutes continues to be maintained. Subcommittee liaisons from the SPMT report at formal SPMT meetings, faculty meetings and in the newsletter. The staff participated in a building-wide inservice related to GEPA and ESPA skills and the integration of technology in classroom instruction. A large percentage of staff has also attended individual workshops focusing on technology, test analysis, and inclusion. Three faculty members attended Yale 101 and 102 training in May. Additionally, all staff participated in a six-hour staff development program conducted by the Comer SDP Yale staff on April 8. Parent facilitator position remains vacant. Extension teacher position remained vacant until May when teacher was hired. One extension teacher has been eliminated from next year's budget due to State mandated cutback. Yale training 101-102 is also not funded in next year's budget visitation with Yale implementation coordinator, cut to 3 visits (less than suggested 4 minimum) due to budget constraints.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Training of Personnel 101-102 was delayed to May. Parent facilitator action form was submitted/never acted on by the Personnel Department. Extension Teacher—Only 1 position approved due to board budget; teacher was dismissed on December 10, 2001. Requested action form was not signed until May 2002.	Strategies to Address Barriers: P.S. #9 staff will present and serve as turnkey personnel. Request will be resubmitted.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 11				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: Implementation is progressing as planned. Professional development has been planned and staff is presently attending workshops on Comer process and teaching strategies to improve instruction. Two guidance counselors were hired; special education teachers were hired.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Do not have a parent liaison; do not have social worker because of budget cut.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Requested parent liaison for 2002-03 school year.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 12				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The Julia A. Barnes School (P.S. #12) has made a commitment to the full implementation of the five benchmarks ingrained in the WSR Model Co-NECT. We have measured our effectiveness with first, the compliance of prescribed activities: School-Wide Literacy Fair (winter), and an array of additional PBL initiatives. Public School No. 12, through its initiation and implementation of the Julia A. Barnes' Poetry Café, has made a successful attempt to promote parent and community involvement with our students. Our school newsletter is also a reflection of the many activities we have involved our students in, through the PBL approach. We will continue to follow the activities and strategies suggested and employed within our current revised Action Plans. The following changes have occurred this school year. Our School Facilitator, Mr. Michael Winds, left on March 4, 2002, after receiving a promotional position at Lincoln High	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Staff changes:</u> This is due to promotions and to grade changes because of low achievement on the GEPA and the district's Midterm and Final Exams. 2. <u>Budget constraints:</u> This cut has impacted upon the Professional Development Training that is needed in Language Arts and Math. 3. <u>New Facilitator will be hired for September. Will need money to train her and all of the new staff on the WSR Co-NECT Model and on the district's and school's Literacy and GEPA strands.</u> 4. <u>The Critical Friends visit went well. Their report was favorable. However, it clearly showed a need to reform how we are addressing the GEPA strands.</u> 	Strategies to Address Barriers: <p>Our Reading Specialist will be returning from her leave and will be utilized half days to assist with the Guided Reading Program and will go in class and present ongoing staff development. Reading and Writing Seminars will be held for our newly appointed teachers (non-tenured staff) and those tenured teachers assigned to a new grade for the second half of the school day.</p> <p>Our science teacher will be assigned to teach science daily to our 6th – 8th graders.</p> <p>We have a new 8th grade math teacher. The teacher hired March 4, 2002, to replace Mr. Major Brown was reassigned to be our social studies teacher. Mr. Saminski will visit Schools 5, 28 and 38 to observe their 8th grade teachers</p>

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 12 (continued)

	<p>School. We will have a replacement for him in September 2002, pending district approval.</p> <p>Ms. Tommi Stephens, our Literacy Coach, Teacher Trainee, and the building's Reading Recovery Teacher has received a new position with the district. We are hoping that she will remain with our school or is replaced as quickly as possible with someone just as qualified to train our staff. We will need training in implementing and assessing the student's instructional needs using the Breakthrough to Literacy Program in the kindergarten. We will also need assistance in the Guided Reading Program, Interactive Writing, Soar to Success, 100 Book Challenge, and with assessing the students using the DRA kits. Intensive training will be needed, and our Reading experts at the district and school levels will be utilized to assist the K-8 staff in addressing our Language Arts and Math's Critical Thinking skill deficiencies. Additionally, we will have to teach the GEPA skills in the format of the test that is administered to the students.</p>		<p>and will be asked to turnkey what he learned to the rest of the staff.</p> <p>The district's supervisors will continue to be used for content training.</p> <p>Our focus for the 2002-03 school year will be on training the staff to implement the Literacy Program to use Rubrics, assess and create tests using the GEPA format to further assess the student's progress. Our goal is to ensure that 75 percent of our students are at or above the proficient level on the GEPA and district-approved tests at all grade levels.</p>
--	---	--	---

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 14				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 2nd Cohort Comer September 1999	Status: The faculty and staff of the Ollie E. Culbreth, Jr., School (P.S. #14) will continue to utilize the “Guiding Principles,” Developmental Pathways and Team Building Techniques. Continue staff training in the School Development Program Process. All staff will use and practice the Guiding Principles of Comer. Staff will continue to utilize the six developmental pathways in their daily lesson plans: Physical, Language, Psychological, Ethical, Social and Cognitive. School Service Broker has been put in place to inservice parents and guardians in parenting skills. “Comer” committees have been established to plan, discuss and implement programs that benefit the school, students and community. All staff and stakeholders will continue to align and instruct using the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards.	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-wide shortage of qualified candidates and applicants in various support staff positions. • Continual lack of teachers not being cognizant of student adversities, which affect their behavior and performance. • Continual lack of parental support in maintaining students’ code of conduct. • In-take of transfer students who are failing and/or below level. • Students who excel in academic areas are placed in other magnet programs at other educational institutions. 	Strategies to Address Barriers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff Development for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Classroom Management/ Conflict Resolution/ Behavioral Modification b. Parent/Teacher Conference with outside agencies for school issues, policies, parenting, etc. c. Inservice for parents by “POPS” (Parents Organizing Parents Strategy) 2. Parent Grants <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reading Program b. Proposed Program for Reading/Math through AT&T, College Prep, and New Jersey City University 3. After School/Extended Day Program for Academics— Reading, Math and Homework 4. Individual tutoring and mentoring from College Prep and New Jersey City University 5. Development of an Honor Society for our Gifted/Talented Students

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 15				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 Mid-year 2nd Cohort (2B) Co-NECT September 2000	Status: As a Co-NECT school, we have been focusing on Project-Based Learning. Our teachers and students respond well to the various projects and themes we have completed. Our entire school participated in the national Co-NECT project “Kids Who Read.” We were extremely pleased with the projects completed by our students pertaining to the books they read and authors they studied. The overwhelming majority of our teachers have been satisfied with the Co-NECT model and the extra resources that are available through the Co-NECT exchange. School Based Budgeting has allowed us the opportunity to add several extension teachers.	Barriers encountered in implementation: None	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: Our Comer educational plan has generated higher achievement on the ESPA and GEPA tests through attainment of the NJCCCS. We have increased all levels of computer competency of students and staff by increased access to upgraded, multifunctional, multimedia, networked workstations and use multi-media video, e-mail, available software, and the Internet to support the NJCCCS. All staff is engaged in ongoing professional development	Barriers encountered in implementation: Once again insufficient funding has created an obstacle in the hiring of a science teacher and a math extension teacher. Additionally, the unavailability of the Implementation Coordinator from Comer to meet with us and be more accessible is an obstacle that needs to be addressed.	Strategies to Address Barriers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Created a position for a math extension teacher to service grades 4-8 2. Departmentalize by grade (5, 6, 7, 8) and assigned an area teacher for each grouping and a specific teacher to teach Science 3. September will meet with representative of Comer to address concerns with principal. The Comer coordinator will plan meetings and workshops

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16 (continued)				
		<p>towards the required one hundred (100) hours. The school environment is safe and conducive to learning. There has been a slight increase in parental involvement due to the hiring of a parent liaison and creation of a "Parent Room."</p> <p>We have a reward system in place to recognize all achievements and accomplishments of staff, parents, students and administration including attendance and growth in attaining NJCCCS and CCWRS.</p>		with our schools throughout the year.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 2nd Cohort Co-NECT September 1999	Status: The Joseph H. Brensinger School (P.S. #17) is in the third year of WSR implementation. Our teachers continue to receive training from the Co-NECT consultant concerning curriculum mapping, school-wide projects, etc. In addition, additional teachers have attended Co-NECT mini-sabbaticals on Assessment and Rubrics, Teaching and Learning, and Integration of Technology. Teachers continue to receive technology training from Tomorrow Today, from our technology coordinator, and from other consultants. Most of our teachers have begun to internalize the idea of project-based teaching and learning as a	Barriers encountered in implementation: Any barriers to WSR implementation previously encountered have been successfully overcome.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17 (continued)				
		method of teaching curriculum content rather than as an additional requirement.		
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20				
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 5 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Comer Implemented: September 2000		Status: The Comer process is being successfully implemented at P.S. 20. In our second year of implementation, we have our entire staff serving on one of four committees. The committees meet regularly to formulate ideas and strategies about how the school can improve and make recommendations to the SPMT. All committees have planned night time activities that encompass families and the development of the child as a whole. The Parent Team meets twice a month and a Parent Facilitator has just been hired. We have had one inservice day that dealt with Comer and the Balanced Curriculum. We attended another Comer inservice on April 18. Three people attended Comer training 101 and 102 in the spring, bringing the number of people trained in the Comer process to nine.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The one barrier that we have encountered is that not enough staff have been trained. We had seventy-one new staff members come to P.S. 20 over the last three years. Forty-six of these people were not even here to vote on choosing the School Development Program as their Whole School Reform Model.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Since budget cuts have limited the opportunities for training, we are using the nine (9) fully trained personnel as turnkey people as an alternative. Every opportunity has been, and will continue to be taken, to implement all components of the SDP (Comer) Process. Balanced curriculum initiative will be fully in place for September 2002 to cover all significant tasks for all units through June 2003. Assessment plan will be implemented starting September 2002.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 22				
Type: E Grade Level: Pre-K – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Co-NECT Implemented: September 2000		Status: Both teachers and students have accepted project-based learning as the educational focus for the school and have demonstrated a high level of interest in applying the elements taught and learned. Teachers are using the Co-NECT Exchange, as	Barriers encountered in implementation: The barriers encountered are the same ones as indicated last year. The available time for teacher professional development is not adequate enough for the many important concepts that need to be	Strategies to Address Barriers: To infuse additional approaches and strategies in the area of mathematics into Project-Based Learning utilizing Paul Lawrence instructional hands-on program.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 22 (continued)				
		well as other on-line resources, for assistance in developing projects, doing research, and providing students with the tools necessary to work within the framework of a technology-based Whole School Reform model.	disseminated to the faculty.	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 23				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The P.S. 23 community has been focused on obtaining technology, receiving training and implementing it into classroom instruction. We are a large staff and this takes most of our time. An additional facilitator was hired as of January.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The largest barrier that we encountered was our size and the need for two full-time Facilitators. Another barrier we have encountered has been the amount of time between processing a Purchase Order and receiving the items. This is especially true with the technology, since it is our focus.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Have the pool and adjoining locker rooms converted into 10x10 ft. cubicles plus lavatory facilities creating Least Restrictive Environment for the staff and students.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 24				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: This is our second year of Comer and we are moving forward to reach our goals and objectives. At this time, our subcommittees meet monthly as well as our SMT. P.S. 24 has had an influx of new teachers, and they need to be trained with respect to Comer. We were expecting Mr. Ken Hardy to train them at one of his on-site visits. Unfortunately, he has not been at our school to date.	Barriers encountered in implementation: A meeting at P.S. 24 was scheduled with Mr. Ken Hardy. Mr. Meluso and the SMT had planned to meet from 2:55 to 4:55 in order to review the daily activities with Mr. Hardy and to receive feedback. Unfortunately, Mr. Hardy did not show up at our school that day or attend the SMT meeting. To date, we have not touched base with him at all. It would be in the best interests of the school to have Mr. Hardy's input and guidance at this time.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Notify Associate Superintendent of problems securing services from the Comer representative.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 25				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: Nicolaus Copernicus School (P.S. 25) is on target in its implementation of Co-NECT for the second year. The Facilitator and Design Team continue to develop and guide the WSR model. Faculty members have attended mini sabbaticals and have “turn-keyed” other faculty members at all grade levels. Each grade level has completed two major projects and a Project Fair was held in February 2002.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Scheduling turnkey sessions has cost the principal one of her faculty meetings each month. Playing “catch-up” with new faculty members coming in at various times of the year is difficult.	Strategies to Address Barriers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By the principal giving up one faculty meeting, turnkey sessions were implemented without additional cost to the school/district. This strategy worked well. 2. As new faculty members arrived, they managed to “catch up” for the most part. Their colleagues on all levels—e.g. grade-level teachers, Design Team members, technology coordinator, facilitator, etc.—all chipped in and helped out.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 2nd Cohort Co-NECT September 1999	Status: We are currently completing our third year as a Co-NECT School. When we began this WSR, we were rated in the ones and twos on the Benchmarks. We have done considerable work in bringing those ratings up to fours and fives. We now employ an annual Project Fair as a showcase for the products of our project-based teaching and learning. We have a directory of resources, including parents, community, business professionals and experts for use in projects. Technology training has increased and is ongoing, so all new teachers will become computer literate. Innovative ideas such as: student-led	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vacancy for the Facilitator has not been filled. District must repost position. 2. The fourth grade classes are presently based in the modular (trailer) units. Internet access is not available; therefore, the full compliment of the use of technology is not successfully in place. Students in fourth grade are using the Computer Lab weekly to get on line. However, this limits their creativity. 	Strategies to Address Barriers: <p>District to repost position</p> <p>Request full Internet access</p>

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27 (continued)				
		conferences, Parents' night out, cultural diversity activities, rubrics, and three-way accountability (parent-teacher-student) are just some of the changes we've instituted in WSR.		
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 28				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: P.S. 28 continues to integrate the key components of our chosen WSR model, Co-NECT, into the daily life of our school community. Project/Inquiry-Based Learning is becoming more prevalent as a method of instruction and planning in our classrooms. Teacher use of technology to support and enhance learning is increasing thanks in part to professional development efforts at P.S. 28. Finally, community involvement is growing as evidenced by partnerships with local community partners.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Increasingly obsolete technology contributes to a frustration among teachers that hinders the utilization of technology in some instances. Anxiety among teachers in adopting "new"/unfamiliar practices in planning, instruction, and assessment also contribute to some hesitation in more rapid implementation of the Co-NECT model. This anxiety will no doubt decrease as teachers build fluency and mastery of WSR/Co-NECT related concepts and methodologies.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Barriers are diminishing. Teacher anxiety has lessened as Project-Based Learning has been implemented.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 4 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The implementation of project-based learning and Breakthrough to Literacy has been an exciting experience for staff and students. There has been an increase in the integration of technology in daily planning which has been spearheaded by additional professional development. Mini-sabbaticals were completed,	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time is a barrier for turnkey mini-sabbatical training • Some positions have yet to be filled due to a variety of reasons: Crisis Intervention, Computer Teacher, Prep position to replace Library 	Strategies to Address Barriers: Vacant positions have been removed from 2002-03 due to budget cuts. Mini-sabbaticals will be at a minimum for 2002-03. We will continue to plan ahead and attempt to get substitutes.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29 (continued)				
		and unfilled positions remain vacant.		
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 30				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 5 2nd Cohort Co-NECT September 1999	Status: As we at P.S. 30 complete our third year of implementation, there have been many accomplishments in our school. We have met the State's criteria of a one computer per five students ratio; we are planning to establish a modified looping cycle (grades K-1-2 and 3-4-5); we continue to review alternate means of assessment; there has been the introduction of Breakthrough to Literacy in our kindergarten classes with plans to introduce it in grade one next year; our teachers are actively seeking Professional Development opportunities.	Barriers encountered in implementation: None	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 31				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 2 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The Anthony J. Infante School participated in a successful Critical Friends visit in February 2002. All components of the Co-NECT model were evident in projects throughout the school.	Barriers encountered in implementation: None	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 4 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: At the core of the Co-NECT model are its 5 Benchmarks (Shared Accountability, Teaching and Learning, Comprehensive Assessment, Team-Based Organization, and Sensible Use of Technology). The Co-NECT	Barriers encountered in implementation: Increasing parent and community involvement (Benchmark 1/Shared Accountability) continues to be our biggest challenge.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Continue to attempt to increase parent and community involvement.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33 (continued)				
		WSR model is being fully implemented at our school. We have a Design Team and Benchmark Committees that work on school initiatives/strategies. The committees focus on advancing our school to the next level on all the Benchmarks according to Co-NECT's rating system.		
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 34				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 Mid-year 2nd Cohort (2B) Comer September 2000	Status: P.S. 34 is a mid-year 2 nd Cohort Comer School. All subcommittees meet on a weekly basis and the SMT meets monthly. Five inservice Comer workshops are scheduled. The principal and two teachers did not attend Yale 102, nor did the assistant principal, guidance counselor and reading specialist. We've encumbered the money for next year, and we have established a new agenda for the 2002-03 school year with Comer. On June 24, we met with a representative from Yale, and starting in the 2002-03 school year, we will schedule meetings every six weeks to facilitate the Comer process to its fullest.	Barriers encountered in implementation: None	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 37				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Alternative School Model September 2000	Status: All in place as well as it can be, based on barriers.	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central office understanding of design • Budget process • Timelines re: staffing 	Strategies to Address Barriers: Continue to explain our process; develop new directions as appropriate.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 38				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 3rd Cohort Co-NECT September 2000	Status: P.S. 38 is progressing nicely. Our school consultant has been very helpful and his training has been very effective. We are moving closer to full implementation.	Barriers encountered in implementation: Additional staff who have come on board throughout the year missed essential training. Schedules needed to be adjusted. Mini sabbaticals spread out over too long of a period. Uncertainty of proposed budget. Budget cuts will impact negatively on the implementation of WSR.	Strategies to Address Barriers: Turnkey training for staff who missed WSR Co-NECT training will be conducted by our facilitator, technology coordinator and design team members.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 39				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 2nd Cohort Comer September 1999	Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs have been implemented to assist in improving student academic performance • The SPMT is functioning effectively • All members of the staff are familiar with the School Development Program's model • Technology is being utilized to enhance student learning • Professional development opportunities are ongoing • The school environment is safe and conducive to learning 	Barriers encountered in implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late contract which led to late securing of services • Freeze on hiring which led to vacancies: parent liaison and in-school suspension teacher (still not filled) • Still some staff resistance to building positive adult and student relationships 	Strategies to Address Barriers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earlier submission of the Comer contract worksheet • Eliminated the in-school suspension teacher from the 2002-03 budget • Continued staff development in the area of building positive adult and student relationships

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 40				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	M 6 – 8 Mid-year 2nd Cohort (2B) Co-NECT September 2000	Status: The Ezra L. Nolan Middle School has completed year two of implementing Co-NECT as its WSR model. In May of 2002, we were the subject of a “Critical Friends Review” sponsored by Co-NECT. We were pleased to receive a positive summary from educators from other Co-NECT schools throughout the country who evaluated our educational program as it relates to the Co-NECT benchmarks. We also conducted a project fair in early May 2002 where a project developed by three of our special needs teachers won second place in a national contest sponsored by Co-NECT. In addition, our design team and benchmark committees will meet during the summer recess to prepare our school for year three of implementation of WSR. We will be addressing adaptation to the five benchmarks while concentrating on areas of assessment and curriculum mapping.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The most prominent barrier to WSR implementation is the lack of common planning time within grade level and project teams. We do utilize the 8:10 - 8:30 block of time as well as faculty meetings to foster team meetings, but this amount seems to be insufficient.	Strategies to Address Barriers: In addition to the 8:10-8:30 block of time already utilized, beginning in September and continuing throughout the 2002-03 school year, the second 45-minute faculty meeting of each month will be completely devoted to common planning. Planning and collaboration among faculty members will be both cross curricular and cross grade with predetermined agendas containing specific goals and objectives for each session.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 41				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E Pre-K – 8 2nd Cohort Comer September 1999	Status: The Fred W. Martin School continues to successfully implement the Comer WSR Model. Through the efforts and guidance of the SPMT, the staff have become more knowledgeable of the components of the Comer model. There is a	Barriers encountered in implementation: Some of the barriers that have been encountered include the lack of support for our Essentials of Literacy Program, district-wide training for the SPMT, the need for increased parent and community	Strategies to Address Barriers: EOL—Recently made contact with a newly assigned representative who visited the school in May to evaluate the program. We are still waiting for feedback in writing and assessment information.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 41 (continued)				
		functioning SPMT, SSST, and Parent Team. Subcommittees and constituent groups are aware of their purpose and are fully functional. We have instituted a Shared Decision Making Problem Solving Lab. The Essentials of Literacy program (EOL) is addressing the needs of our lowest functioning second and third graders. The implementation of the Title I School Improvement Accountability Grant Program has enabled us to provide extra services for our students. On-site staff development and teacher mentoring are provided by the Global Institute for Maximizing Potential.	involvement, staffing and providing coverage for staff development training. Also, the processing of contracts causes a delay in the implementation of programs.	SPMT—Ken Hardy made visit in June. Set up one visit in the fall. Parent Community Involvement—Applied for a parent involvement grant. We are in the second round for selection. Plans are in place to hold programs and plan activities (day and evening) that would increase parental/community involvement. Staffing—interviewing now for September. Contracts—preparing now for processing in August pending budget approval.
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	E K – 4 3rd Cohort Comer September 2000	Status: Whole School Reform initiatives are progressing as planned at the Constance P. Nichols School. The Comer School Development Program structures are in effect. All subcommittees of the School Management Team are functioning and making recommendations to the SMT. Many programs, originating at the subcommittee level, are being implemented. Staff members are attending various professional development sessions to hone their skills and to turnkey train colleagues and parents in ways to improve instruction and increase student achievement. The	Barriers encountered in implementation: Initially, it was difficult to sustain broad-based parental involvement. However, with the advent of our parent liaison in January, there has been a renewed interest. Our parent liaison works closely with the staff, attends professional development and collaborates to train parents in Whole School Reform philosophy and district procedures. Additionally, she solicits suggestions for discussion on topics of interest to parents. This staff position has been invaluable as a bridge between school and community. We are finding that her presence helps to allay parent	Strategies to Address Barriers: Not applicable

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42 (continued)				
		<p>curriculum subcommittee has worked to analyze our students' past performance and to plan ways to address weak areas. All staff members are learning of demands of other grade levels and working with a team spirit. Our facilitator has ongoing orientation sessions with students so that they understand the Comer model. He is also working with parents, and home/school communications have become a priority. All programs and meetings are documented in a school calendar; minutes from meetings are compiled and posted for the entire school community to read.</p>	<p>and community misconceptions about the school and fosters improved public relations. Therefore, our team is surmounting former barriers.</p>	
ACADEMY I				
Type: M Grade Level: 6 – 8 Cohort: 3 rd Cohort Model: Coalition of Essential Schools Implemented: September 2000		Status: The Coalition of Essential Schools' principles have been incorporated into the school's environment. The district's literacy plan has been fused with the Coalition of Essential Schools' principles and are part of the teacher's instructional planning.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The school continues to maintain vacancies in the following positions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistant Principal • Health Social Services Coordinator • Site-Based Coordinator • Case Manager 	Strategies to Address Barriers: The Assistant Principal continues to be in the 2002-03 budget. Academy I will once again ask the district for additional classroom space for the Accelerated and Enrichment Program. Next year, the 7 th grade will have a class size of 25:1. We were unable to take in any new 7 th grade students for the 2002-03 school year.

ACADEMY II				
Type: Grade Level: Cohort: Model: Implemented:	M 6 – 8 Mid-year 2nd Cohort (2B) America's Choice September 2000	Status: We have rebounded from the untimely changes that affected our Stage II implementation. The Writers' and Readers' Workshop was implemented and teachers received follow-up training from the Design Coach, Literacy Coordinator, and America's Choice consultants. The model classroom is in place with minor adjustments being required. The Principal's Book of the Month and 25 Book Campaign were in full operation and students responded to the books. The second testing results of the New Standards Reference Exam for Language Arts shows improvement in all areas.	Barriers encountered in implementation: The math program is on hold until the Math Coach is released from P.S. 24.	Strategies to Address Barriers: As of September 2002, it is expected that the Math Coach will be assigned to Academy II. All paperwork has been processed.

COHORT II SCHOOLS -- ESPA

School/Model	Subject	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#14 Comer	Language Arts	17.2	22.2	29.8	29.8	43.6	13.8	37.3	6.3
	Mathematics	20.9	37.5	15.8	15.8	28.2	12.4	25.7	2.5
	Science	42.6	54.0	45.7	45.7	Not Administered	N/A	50.6	N/A
#17 Co-NECT	Language Arts	29.3	32.5	64.2	64.2	78.8	14.6	66.0	12.8
	Mathematics	28.7	26.1	34.3	34.3	52.0	17.7	41.1	10.9
	Science	62.6	60.4	75.2	76.0	Not Administered	N/A	76.2	N/A
#27 Co-NECT	Language Arts	39.3	41.5	67.0	67.0	85.4	18.4	68.3	17.1
	Mathematics	45.0	47.5	38.7	38.7	54.3	15.6	44.8	9.5
	Science	72.4	68.7	65.4	65.4	Not Administered	N/A	67.0	N/A
#30 Co-NECT	Language Arts	31.4	18.2	63.2	63.2	67.8	4.6	65.2	2.6
	Mathematics	52.1	34.4	50.0	50.0	42.4	-7.6	54.2	-11.8
	Science	74.3	65.9	74.7	74.7	Not Administered	N/A	75.7	N/A
#39 Comer	Language Arts	19.0	6.7	22.9	22.9	61.8	38.9	31.6	30.2
	Mathematics	11.7	20.3	20.4	20.4	39.4	19.0	29.5	9.9
	Science	47.5	38.3	34.7	34.7	Not Administered	N/A	41.4	N/A
#41 Comer	Language Arts	41.4	19.3	32.9	32.9	51.5	18.6	39.9	11.6
	Mathematics	40.4	27.8	6.3	6.3	26.5	20.2	17.8	8.7
	Science	55.0	45.5	35.5	35.5	Not Administered	N/A	42.1	N/A

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- ESPA

School/Model	Subject	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#5 Co-NECT	Language Arts	57.1	50.0	86.5	86.5	85.5	-1.0	87.5	-2.0
	Mathematics	64.3	50.0	37.3	37.3	82.6	45.3	43.6	39.0
	Science	83.4	80.9	84.8	84.8	Not Administered	N/A	85.8	N/A
#6 Comer	Language Arts	57.1	43.1	67.7	67.7	94.8	27.1	68.9	25.9
	Mathematics	68.2	47.1	57.6	57.6	65.0	7.4	60.5	4.5
	Science	83.5	81.4	79.8	79.8	Not Administered	N/A	80.8	N/A
#8 Comer	Language Arts	50.4	31.3	57.4	58.2	60.2	2.0	60.3	-0.1
	Mathematics	62.6	58.8	49.2	49.2	52.1	2.9	53.5	-1.4
	Science	74.7	76.5	76.0	76.0	Not Administered	N/A	77.0	N/A
#9 Comer	Language Arts	30.4	53.3	70.8	70.8	75.6	4.8	71.8	3.8
	Mathematics	39.2	62.2	54.1	54.1	35.5	-18.6	57.6	-22.1
	Science	54.5	80.0	83.3	83.3	Not Administered	N/A	84.3	N/A
#11 Comer	Language Arts	56.6	40.3	78.1	78.1	85.2	7.1	79.1	6.1
	Mathematics	69.3	65.0	58.9	58.9	63.9	5.0	61.6	2.3
	Science	84.2	83.1	76.7	76.7	Not Administered	N/A	77.7	N/A
#12 Co-NECT	Language Arts	44.4	24.4	49.0	49.0	50.9	1.9	53.3	-2.4
	Mathematics	24.4	31.0	19.2	19.2	41.8	22.6	28.5	13.3
	Science	53.4	72.1	55.8	55.8	Not Administered	N/A	59.0	N/A

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- ESPA

School/Model	Subject	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#16 Comer	Language Arts	48.1	48.5	79.4	79.4	97.0	17.6	80.4	16.6
	Mathematics	66.7	66.7	47.0	47.0	57.6	10.6	51.7	5.9
	Science	92.6	87.9	91.1	91.1	Not Administered	N/A	92.1	N/A
#20 Comer	Language Arts	33.3	36.2	64.2	64.2	77.8	13.6	66.0	11.8
	Mathematics	17.7	30.8	30.9	30.9	36.2	5.3	38.3	-2.1
	Science	56.5	65.7	66.7	66.7	Not Administered	N/A	68.1	N/A
#22 Co-NECT	Language Arts	22.4	23.9	44.1	44.1	45.9	1.8	49.3	-3.4
	Mathematics	35.9	26.8	19.4	19.4	31.6	12.2	28.7	2.9
	Science	47.6	49.3	39.7	39.7	Not Administered	N/A	45.6	N/A
#23 Co-NECT	Language Arts	27.0	30.8	64.2	64.2	71.6	7.4	66.0	5.6
	Mathematics	31.3	54.2	37.6	37.6	47.2	9.6	43.8	3.4
	Science	60.5	75.0	74.6	74.6	Not Administered	N/A	75.6	N/A
#24 Comer	Language Arts	39.8	36.0	59.3	59.3	70.8	11.5	61.9	8.9
	Mathematics	26.0	50.6	28.6	28.6	41.7	13.1	36.3	5.4
	Science	60.0	72.0	71.1	71.1	Not Administered	N/A	72.1	N/A
#25 Co-NECT	Language Arts	41.3	39.5	75.2	75.2	79.0	3.8	76.2	2.8
	Mathematics	40.1	56.8	54.7	54.7	69.6	14.9	58.1	11.5
	Science	75.4	79.2	84.6	84.6	Not Administered	N/A	85.6	N/A

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- ESPA

School/Model	Subject	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#28 Co-NECT	Language Arts	45.0	45.7	71.3	71.3	69.1	-2.2	72.3	-3.2
	Mathematics	46.7	61.0	44.6	44.6	43.0	-1.6	49.7	-6.7
	Science	83.5	84.9	74.2	74.2	Not Administered	N/A	75.2	N/A
#29 Co-NECT	Language Arts	41.3	10.9	38.9	38.9	66.0	27.1	44.9	21.1
	Mathematics	39.6	21.8	26.0	26.0	50.9	24.9	34.2	16.7
	Science	51.0	43.5	51.8	51.8	Not Administered	N/A	55.7	N/A
#33 Co-NECT	Language Arts	64.7	77.3	81.3	81.3	93.7	12.4	82.3	11.4
	Mathematics	72.1	81.8	66.3	66.3	71.4	5.1	67.8	3.6
	Science	91.2	93.9	86.3	86.3	Not Administered	N/A	87.3	N/A
#37 Alternative School Model	Language Arts	73.8	61.0	84.8	84.8	96.6	11.8	85.8	10.8
	Mathematics	95.4	78.0	84.7	84.7	83.9	-0.8	85.7	-1.8
	Science	95.4	88.1	86.4	86.4	Not Administered	N/A	87.4	N/A
#38 Co-NECT	Language Arts	49.4	28.3	67.9	68.0	65.6	-2.4	69.1	-3.5
	Mathematics	53.9	43.4	50.5	50.5	50.0	-0.5	54.6	-4.6
	Science	85.4	69.6	79.8	79.8	Not Administered	N/A	80.8	N/A
#42 Comer	Language Arts	61.3	65.6	71.9	71.9	96.8	24.9	72.9	23.9
	Mathematics	45.1	56.3	46.9	46.9	61.3	14.4	51.6	9.7
	Science	74.2	71.9	71.9	71.9	Not Administered	N/A	72.9	N/A

COHORT II SCHOOLS -- GEPA

School/Model	Subject	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#14 Comer	Language Arts	61.4	56.0	42.9	42.9	47.1	4.2	48.3	-1.2
	Mathematics	30.2	29.2	21.4	21.4	20.5	-0.9	30.3	-9.8
	Science	N/A	43.8	33.3	33.3	47.0	13.7	40.3	6.7
#17 Co-NECT	Language Arts	79.0	78.6	69.3	69.3	62.8	-6.5	70.3	-7.5
	Mathematics	50.6	55.4	58.2	58.2	69.2	11.0	61.0	8.2
	Science	N/A	43.4	44.3	44.3	58.5	14.2	49.4	9.1
#27 Co-NECT	Language Arts	98.8	92.4	92.2	92.2	78.6	-13.6	93.2	-14.6
	Mathematics	74.0	82.3	74.5	74.5	74.7	0.2	75.5	-0.8
	Science	N/A	74.7	76.7	76.7	78.6	1.9	77.7	0.9
#30 Co-NECT	Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#39 Comer	Language Arts	56.1	74.2	82.3	82.3	51.9	-30.4	83.3	-31.4
	Mathematics	29.3	43.8	73.5	73.5	31.0	-42.5	74.5	-43.5
	Science	N/A	34.4	55.9	55.9	24.1	-31.8	59.1	-35.0
#41 Comer	Language Arts	36.5	46.1	49.4	49.4	50.0	0.6	53.7	-3.7
	Mathematics	7.0	6.6	12.9	12.9	14.7	1.8	23.3	-8.6
	Science	N/A	19.7	29.4	29.4	26.5	-2.9	37.0	-10.5

COHORT IIB SCHOOLS -- GEPA

School/Model	Subject	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#3 Co-NECT	Language Arts	91.9	89.3	81.8	81.8	78.1	-3.7	82.8	-4.7
	Mathematics	37.8	53.6	45.4	45.4	84.4	39.0	50.3	34.1
	Science	N/A	57.2	39.4	42.4	53.1	10.7	45.3	7.8
#15 Co-NECT	Language Arts	54.8	36.7	21.2	21.2	32.4	11.2	30.2	2.2
	Mathematics	16.7	13.4	16.7	16.7	9.5	-7.2	26.4	-16.9
	Science	N/A	16.9	15.2	15.2	25.7	10.5	25.2	0.5
#34 Comer	Language Arts	62.7	61.8	64.4	64.4	45.0	-19.4	66.2	-21.2
	Mathematics	35.3	30.9	64.4	64.4	55.0	-9.4	66.2	-11.2
	Science	N/A	23.6	54.2	54.2	35.9	-18.3	57.7	-21.8
#40 Co-NECT	Language Arts	83.6	76.6	55.3	55.3	61.3	6.0	58.6	2.7
	Mathematics	41.9	51.2	69.9	69.9	48.8	-21.1	70.9	-22.1
	Science	N/A	41.6	53.4	53.4	53.2	-0.2	57.0	-3.8
Academy II America's Choice	Language Arts	22.6	27.9	15.0	15.0	11.6	-3.4	25.0	-13.4
	Mathematics	7.3	6.9	9.0	10.3	6.0	-4.3	20.0	-14.0
	Science	N/A	13.7	12.3	12.3	17.6	5.3	22.8	-5.2

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- GEPA

School/Model	Subject	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#5 Co-NECT	Language Arts	89.6	90.9	93.5	93.5	89.7	-3.8	94.5	-4.8
	Mathematics	72.4	84.8	96.8	96.8	92.3	-4.5	97.8	-5.5
	Science	N/A	63.6	77.4	77.4	79.5	2.1	78.4	1.1
#6 Comer	Language Arts	93.7	89.4	93.2	93.2	83.8	-9.4	94.2	-10.4
	Mathematics	65.3	61.8	83.8	83.8	69.8	-14.0	84.8	-15.0
	Science	N/A	67.1	85.1	85.1	80.3	-4.8	86.1	-5.8
#8 Comer	Language Arts	85.2	80.5	71.8	71.8	66.6	-5.2	72.8	-6.2
	Mathematics	67.9	54.8	56.5	57.7	37.3	-20.4	59.6	-22.3
	Science	N/A	54.8	63.6	63.6	53.9	-9.7	65.5	-11.6
#9 Comer	Language Arts	69.4	70.4	66.7	66.7	15.4	-51.3	68.1	-52.7
	Mathematics	34.3	48.1	36.7	36.7	7.7	-29.0	43.1	-35.4
	Science	N/A	25.9	50.0	50.0	15.4	-34.6	54.2	-38.8
#11 Comer	Language Arts	82.5	73.3	81.4	81.4	74.0	-7.4	82.4	-8.4
	Mathematics	67.5	71.1	79.5	79.5	80.0	0.5	80.5	-0.5
	Science	N/A	68.8	70.5	70.5	64.0	-6.5	71.5	-7.5
#12 Co-NECT	Language Arts	59.1	60.0	63.6	63.6	20.5	-43.1	65.5	-45.0
	Mathematics	17.8	14.3	27.3	27.3	7.7	-19.6	35.3	-27.6
	Science	N/A	25.7	50.0	50.0	15.4	-34.6	54.2	-38.8

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- GEPA

School/Model	Subject	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
#16 Comer	Language Arts	87.6	92.0	93.3	93.3	80.0	-13.3	94.3	-14.3
	Mathematics	62.5	56.0	76.7	80.0	84.0	4.0	77.7	6.3
	Science	N/A	56.0	83.3	83.3	72.0	-11.3	84.3	-12.3
#20 Comer	Language Arts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
#22 Co-NECT	Language Arts	63.2	61.3	48.8	48.8	68.2	19.4	53.2	15.0
	Mathematics	22.9	22.6	43.9	43.9	60.0	16.1	49.1	10.9
	Science	N/A	14.5	48.7	48.7	44.4	-4.3	53.1	-8.7
#23 Co-NECT	Language Arts	85.6	89.6	81.7	81.7	82.2	0.5	82.7	-0.5
	Mathematics	77.3	73.1	85.4	85.4	83.8	-1.6	86.4	-2.6
	Science	N/A	70.2	63.5	63.5	72.6	9.1	65.4	7.2
#24 Comer	Language Arts	75.3	91.0	93.2	93.2	82.7	-10.5	94.2	-11.5
	Mathematics	52.4	55.0	72.7	72.7	61.7	-11.0	73.7	-12.0
	Science	N/A	58.0	57.9	57.9	62.9	5.0	60.8	2.1
#25 Co-NECT	Language Arts	94.7	96.6	94.6	94.6	93.2	-1.4	95.6	-2.4
	Mathematics	64.2	78.0	81.5	81.5	77.8	-3.7	82.5	-4.7
	Science	N/A	80.4	85.9	85.9	83.7	-2.2	86.9	-3.2

COHORT III SCHOOLS -- GEPA

School/Model	Subject	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Target	Diff. from Target
Academy I Coalition of Essential Schools	Language Arts	67.0	57.7	64.8	64.8	59.3	-5.5	66.5	-7.2
	Mathematics	61.0	50.9	61.3	61.3	59.6	-1.7	63.6	-4.0
	Science	N/A	50.9	60.2	60.2	59.1	-1.1	62.7	-3.6

Early Childhood Plan Statement

THREE- AND FOUR-YEAR OLD SUMMARY:

Number of 3- and 4-year old students

served in 2000-01: 2622, including

- In district (4-year olds): 1454
- DHS Licensed Providers (3-year olds): 1168

Served in 2001-02: 3459, including

- In-district (4-year olds): 1806
- DHS licensed providers (3-year olds): 1653

Waiver Requested: No

FIVE-YEAR OLD SUMMARY:

Number of 5-year old students

served in 2000-01: 2294

Served in 2001-02: 2475

Waiver Requested: No

Number of P-3 certified staff: 129 (in district); 114 (at community centers)

Number of Preschool staff not holding P-3 certifications: 0 (in district); 10 (at community centers)

District Strategies to Promote Timely Certification of Teaching Staff:

Semester reports from colleges regarding enrollment and progress of students enrolled in P-3 courses

Obstacles to Implementation:

Schedule of staff in daycare centers (8-10 hours) has made it very difficult for them to attend certification classes.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION (CSR) SCHOOL-BY-SCHOOL SUMMARY BY GRADE LEVEL¹
PRIMARY/ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOLS

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 1					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade	41	2	2	Yes	
2 nd Grade	56	3	3	Yes	
1 st Grade	43	3	3	Yes	
Kindergarten	87	7	7	Yes	
Pre-K	30	2	4	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	33	2	2	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
7 th Grade	40	2	2	Yes	
6 th Grade	43	2	2	Yes	
5 th Grade	48	2	2	No	Reading Specialist provides developmental reading for 10 students in greatest need—5 students from each class
4 th Grade	54	3	3	Yes	
3 rd Grade	54	3	3	Yes	
2 nd Grade	48	3	3	Yes	
1 st Grade	60	3	3	Yes	
Kindergarten	29	2	2T + 2TA	Yes	
Pre-K	28	2	2T + 2TA	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	70	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	74	3	3	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group instruction • Extended day program services
6 th Grade	84	3	3	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group instruction • Extended day program services

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
5 th Grade	115	5	5	Yes	
4 th Grade	95	4	4	Yes	
3 rd Grade	98	5	5	Yes	
2 nd Grade	83	4	4	Yes	
1 st Grade	83	4	4	Yes	
Kindergarten	80	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	60	4	4	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 6					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	81	4	5	Yes	
7 th Grade	115	5	6	Yes	
6 th Grade	121	5	6	Yes	
5 th Grade	108	4	6	Yes	
4 th Grade	87	4	5	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 6 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
3 rd Grade	90	4	5	Yes	
2 nd Grade	109	4	6	Yes	
1 st Grade	94	4	5	Yes	
Kindergarten	105	5	5	Yes	
Pre-K	90	6	6	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 8					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	81	4	4	Yes	
7 th Grade	98	4	4	No	
6 th Grade	99	4	4	No	
5 th Grade	125	5	5	No	
4 th Grade	110	4	4	No	
3 rd Grade	126	6	6	Yes	
2 nd Grade	171	8	8	No	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 8 (continued)

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
1 st Grade	167	8	8	Yes	
Kindergarten	93	5	5	Yes	
Pre-K	54	4	4	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 9

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	34	2	2 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
7 th Grade	43	2	2 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
6 th Grade	56	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
5 th Grade	48	3	3	Yes	
4 th Grade	45	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
3 rd Grade	41	2	2	Yes	
2 nd Grade	49	2	2	No	One extension teacher position filled May 2002
1 st Grade	49	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
Kindergarten	41	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 9 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
Pre-K	39	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 11					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	65	2	2	No	ESL/Basic Skills
7 th Grade	78	3	3	No	ESL/Basic Skills
6 th Grade	95	4	4	No	ESL/Basic Skills
5 th Grade	107	4	4	No	ESL/Basic Skills
4 th Grade	82	3	4	Yes	
3 rd Grade	90	4	5	Yes	
2 nd Grade	97	5	5	Yes	
1 st Grade	90	4	5	Yes	
Kindergarten	65	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	26	2	2	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 12					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	42	2	2	Yes	We began our school year with one class of 26 students. Because of the increased enrollment of students from other districts and the United States, we had to utilize our Math Extension Teacher. He became a regular 8 th grade teacher. Our 8 th grade increased from 26 to 42 students.
7 th Grade	37	2	2	Yes	We were able to keep enrollment below 23 students.
6 th Grade	46	2	2	Yes	We were able to keep enrollment balanced at 23 students.
5 th Grade	47	2	2	Yes	We were not able to hire additional staff. Utilized Special Education Teacher to provide in-class support as part of our Inclusion Plan.
4 th Grade	64	3	3	Yes	We were able to keep classes balanced at 23.
3 rd Grade	63	3	3	Yes	We were able to keep classes at 21.
2 nd Grade	52	3	3	Yes	We were able to keep classes below 21.
1 st Grade	48	3	3	Yes	We were able to keep classes below 21.
Kindergarten	37	2	2	Yes	We were able to hire an aide.
Pre-K	30	2	2	Yes	We were able to keep classes at 15.

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 14

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	43	2	2	Yes	
7 th Grade	54	3	3	Yes	
6 th Grade	63	3	3	Yes	
5 th Grade	64	3	3	Yes	
4 th Grade	43	3	3	Yes	
3 rd Grade	58	3	3	Yes	
2 nd Grade	60	3	3	Yes	
1 st Grade	52	3	3	Yes	
Kindergarten	44	3	3	Yes	
Pre-K	42	3	3	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 15

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	71	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	71	3	3	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 15 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
6 th Grade	80	4	4	Yes	
5 th Grade	88	4	5	Yes	
4 th Grade	88	6	6	Yes	
3 rd Grade	72	4	4	Yes	
2 nd Grade	88	4	4	Yes	
1 st Grade	87	5	5	Yes	
Kindergarten	63	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	71	5	5	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	27	2	2	Yes	
7 th Grade	41	2	2	Yes	
6 th Grade	29	2	2	Yes	
5 th Grade	40	2	2	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
4 th Grade	38	2	2	Yes	
3 rd Grade	41	2	2	Yes	
2 nd Grade	38	2	2	Yes	
1 st Grade	39	2	2	Yes	
Kindergarten	29	2	2	Yes	
Pre-K	29	2	2	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	110	4	4	No	Extension Teacher in L.A. for one 6 th , one 7 th , one 8 th grade class
7 th Grade	109	4	4	No	
6 th Grade	105	4	4	No	
5 th Grade	154	6	6	No	Extension Teacher in L.A. for 3 classes for 90 minute blocks
4 th Grade	154	6	6	No	
3 rd Grade	154	6	6	No	Extension Teacher in L.A. for 3 classes for 90 minute blocks

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
2 nd Grade	159	6	6	No	Extension Teacher in L.A. for 3 classes for 90 minute blocks plus Teacher Assistants
1 st Grade	130	6	6	Yes	
Kindergarten	60	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	115	8	8	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade	91	4	5	Yes	
4 th Grade	86	4	4	Yes	
3 rd Grade	96	4	5	No	Class reduction Computer Teacher + (1) inclusion class
2 nd Grade	76	4	4	Yes	
1 st Grade	82	4	5	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
Kindergarten	81	4	8	Yes	
Pre-K	42	3	6	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 22					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	50	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	82	4	4	Yes	
6 th Grade	124	8	8	Yes	
5 th Grade	91	7	7	Yes	
4 th Grade	110	8	8	Yes	
3 rd Grade	71	5	5	Yes	
2 nd Grade	74	5	6	Yes	
1 st Grade	110	7	8	Yes	
Kindergarten	58	4	5	Yes	
Pre-K	168	16	17	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 23					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	125	4	4	No	Budget permitting, hire additional teachers per classroom 5-8 to reduce class size compliance
7 th Grade	152	5	5	No	
6 th Grade	162	5	5	No	
5 th Grade	147	5	5	No	
4 th Grade	138	5	5	No	1 Ext.
3 rd Grade	154	5	5	No	2 Ext.
2 nd Grade	136	5	5	No	2 Ext.
1 st Grade	110	5	5	No	2 Ext.
Kindergarten	180	7	7	No	7 Aides
Pre-K	255	17	17	Yes	17 Aides
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 24					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	95	4	4	Yes	
7 th Grade	134	5	6	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 24 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
6 th Grade	133	5	6	Yes	
5 th Grade	183	6	7	Yes	
4 th Grade	120	4	5	Yes	
3 rd Grade	98	4	5	Yes	
2 nd Grade	103	4	5	Yes	
1 st Grade	97	5	5	Yes	
Kindergarten	63	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	27	2	2	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 25					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	131	5	5	No	Departmentalized structure; no space
7 th Grade	108	5	5	Yes	
6 th Grade	133	5	5	No	Inclusionary teachers in a classroom
5 th Grade	137	5	5	No	No more space

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 25 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
4 th Grade	114	5	5	Yes	
3 rd Grade	125	5	5	No	Extension teachers utilized
2 nd Grade	152	5	5	No	Teacher assistants in every room
1 st Grade	124	5	5	No	Teacher assistants/aides in every room
Kindergarten	73	5	5	Yes	
Pre-K					
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	116	4	4	No	29 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)
7 th Grade	132	5	5	No	26.4 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)
6 th Grade	113	5	5	Yes	
5 th Grade	138	5	5	No	27 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)
4 th Grade	122	5	5	No	24.4 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)
3 rd Grade	127	5	5	No	25.4 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27 (continued)

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
2 nd Grade	114	5	5	No	22.8 per class (class size reduction teacher needed)
1 st Grade	99	5	5	Yes	
Kindergarten	100	6	6	No	Teacher aides are in the classrooms
Pre-K	60	4	4	Yes	

*Enrollment as of July 1, 2002

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 28

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	115	5	5	Yes	
7 th Grade	132	5	5	No	
6 th Grade	139	6	6	Yes	
5 th Grade	136	5	5	No	
4 th Grade	153	6	6	No	
3 rd Grade	144	6	6	No	Extension Teacher—90 minute L.A. block
2 nd Grade	131	6	6	No	Extension Teacher—90 minute L.A. block

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 28 (continued)

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
1 st Grade	161	7	7	No	Extension Teacher—90 minute L.A. block
Kindergarten	89	6	6	Yes	
Pre-K					

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade	59	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
3 rd Grade	50	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
2 nd Grade	53	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	
1 st Grade	67	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	Teacher Assistants and Extension Teacher assigned
Kindergarten	54	3	3 + 1 Incl.	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
Pre-K	195	13	14 + 13 Aides	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 30					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade	122	6	*10	Yes	
4 th Grade	112	5	*8	Yes	
3 rd Grade	119	5	*7	Yes	
2 nd Grade	107	6	*8	Yes	
1 st Grade	134	7	*9	Yes	
Kindergarten	92	6	*8	Yes	
Pre-K	133	10	*10	Yes	
*Includes in-class support staff as well as class size reduction staff.					

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 31					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade					
2 nd Grade*	42	2	3	Yes	
1 st Grade	40	3	4	Yes	
Kindergarten	40	3	4	Yes	
Pre-K	90	6	7	Yes	
*Projected (2 nd grade is being established for the 2002-03 school year)					
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
7 th Grade					
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade	72	3	3	No	Extension Teacher during L.A.
3 rd Grade	79	3	3	No	Extension Teacher during L.A.
2 nd Grade	70	3	3	No	Extension Teacher during L.A.
1 st Grade	90	3	3	No	Extension Teacher during L.A.
Kindergarten	46	3	3	Yes	
Pre-K	22	2	2	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 34					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	47	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	56	3	3	Yes	
6 th Grade	78	3	3	No	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 34 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
5 th Grade	96	4	4	No	
4 th Grade	118	5	5	No	
3 rd Grade	87	4	4	No	
2 nd Grade	99	4	4	No	
1 st Grade	88	4	4	No	
Kindergarten	62	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	12	1	1	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 37					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	50	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	66	3	3	Yes	
6 th Grade	60	3	3	Yes	
5 th Grade	68	3	3	Yes	
4 th Grade	76	4	4	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 37 (continued)

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
3 rd Grade	78	4	4	Yes	
2 nd Grade	72	4	4	Yes	
1 st Grade	58	3	4	Yes	
Kindergarten	60	4	4	Yes	
Pre-K	60	4	4	Yes	

All grade levels contain one inclusion class

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 38

GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	88	4	4	Yes	
7 th Grade	106	4	4	No	
6 th Grade	134	4	4	No	
5 th Grade	115	4	4	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extension teachers—science and Language Arts CSR teachers (2)
4 th Grade	110	4	4	No	
3 rd Grade	104	4	4	No	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 38 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
2 nd Grade	104	4	4	No	1 CSR Teacher; 1 CSR vacancy; Teacher Assistants
1 st Grade	84	4	4	Yes	
Kindergarten	63	3	3	Yes	
Pre-K	54	4	4	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 39					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	32	2	2	Yes	
7 th Grade	48	3	3	Yes	
6 th Grade	36	2	2	Yes	
5 th Grade	61	3	3	Yes	
4 th Grade	43	3	3	Yes	
3 rd Grade	46	3	3	Yes	
2 nd Grade	41	3	3	Yes	
1 st Grade	53	3	3	Yes	

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 39 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
Kindergarten	40	3	6	Yes	
Pre-K	27	2	4	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 40					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	152*	7	7	Yes	
7 th Grade	208*	8	8	No	Realignment of staff depending upon actual numbers
6 th Grade	250*	10	10	No	Realignment of staff depending upon actual numbers
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade					
2 nd Grade					
1 st Grade					
Kindergarten					
Pre-K					
<i>*Anticipated</i>					

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 41					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	109	4	4	Yes	
7 th Grade	79	4	4	Yes	
6 th Grade	96	5	5	Yes	
5 th Grade	102	5	5	Yes	
4 th Grade	75	4	4	Yes	
3 rd Grade	71	4	4	Yes	
2 nd Grade	68	4	4	Yes	
1 st Grade	64	4	4	Yes	
Kindergarten	49	3	3	Yes	
Pre-K	30	4	4	Yes	
PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade					
7 th Grade					

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42 (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade	35	2	2	Yes	
3 rd Grade	32	2	2	Yes	
2 nd Grade	30	2	2	Yes	
1 st Grade	44	2	2	Yes	
Kindergarten	19	1	1	Yes	
Pre-K					
ACADEMY I—ACCELERATED AND ENRICHMENT PROGRAM					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	62	3	3	Yes	
7 th Grade	68	3	3	No	Requested additional classroom space
6 th Grade	77	4	4	Yes	
5 th Grade					

ACADEMY I—ACCELERATED AND ENRICHMENT PROGRAM <i>(continued)</i>					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade					
2 nd Grade					
1 st Grade					
Kindergarten					
Pre-K					
ACADEMY I—STATE APPROVED ALTERNATIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	50	5	5	Yes	
7 th Grade	29	3	3	Yes	
6 th Grade					
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade					

ACADEMY I—STATE APPROVED ALTERNATIVE MIDDLE SCHOOL <i>(continued)</i>					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
2 nd Grade					
1 st Grade					
Kindergarten					
Pre-K					
ACADEMY II					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
8 th Grade	84	8	8	Yes	
7 th Grade	42	4	4	Yes	
6 th Grade	12	1	1	Yes	
5 th Grade					
4 th Grade					
3 rd Grade					
2 nd Grade					
1 st Grade					

ACADEMY II (continued)					
GRADE LEVEL (as applicable)	# OF STUDENTS	# OF CLASSES	# OF TEACHING STAFF	COMPLIANT WITH ABBOTT REGULATIONS?	STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS NON-COMPLIANCE?
Kindergarten					
Pre-K					

¹6A:24-4.1(9) indicates required class sizes as follows: Pre-K requires 1:15 with an aide; grades K-3 – 1:21 (kindergarten requires an aide); grades 4-8 – 1:23; grades 9-12 – 1:24.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION (CSR) SCHOOL-BY-SCHOOL SUMMARY, HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

SCHOOL	Functional Capacity*	School Enrollment (as of 10/15/01)	OVER-SUBSCRIPTION		ACTIONS TO ADDRESS OVER-SUBSCRIPTION
			Yes	No	
DHS	2018	2755	X		To delete low enrollment classes and offer more sections of other courses.
FHS	1302	1536	X		Staggered schedule Added a zero block at 7:15 a.m. Added a fifth block after 3 p.m. until 5 p.m. Hired additional teachers Monitoring class sizes and making adjustments to balance classes Creation of additional classroom space (budget constraints)
LAHS	N/A	137		X	The anticipated enrollment for the fall is 203. As of this date (July 1, 2002), the school is short four classrooms, the number needed to accommodate the incoming freshman class. There is no more interior space in our present site; State regulations for alternative high schools mandate a maximum class size of twelve; the classrooms we have can hold no more than fifteen—even if we were not bound by that regulation. An additional site is being sought, but at this time, we have no room to include new students where we are, and no new place to put them. The site at 140 Sip Avenue has eleven classrooms, three offices and a cafeteria; at a minimum, we need four more classrooms. Two hundred students in fifteen rooms would give us an average class size of thirteen to fourteen. Our average daily attendance is over 90 percent, so absences would not create room. Absent new space, there are no good choices.
LHS	1193	1092		X	Not applicable
MAHS	634	594		X	McNair Academic High School received a Foreign Language Teacher and a Computer Teacher in the 2001-02 school year. The Foreign Language Teacher was hired to reduce class size. The Computer Teacher had to have knowledge of Java. None of the candidates interviewed had this knowledge until we found a teacher on July 3, 2002. This person is being recommended for the position for September 1, 2002. In the 2002-03 Budget approved by the NJDOE, a Science Teacher was approved to reduce class size.
SHS	1412	1355		X	Not applicable

*Per NJDOE/Approved District Long-Range Facilities Management Plan

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) STATUS, K-8

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 1

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Required Positions Filled:			
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 3

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Required Positions Filled:			
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 5

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Required Positions Filled:			
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 6

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Required Positions Filled:			
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 8

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 9

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Due to resignation of teacher, position was vacant in June. Interviews for new Library Media Tech will be held during summer.		

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 11

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors? Extension Teachers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 12

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 14

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 15

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 16

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 17

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 20

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 22

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 23

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 24

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 25

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 27

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 28

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 29

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 30

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 31

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 33

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 34

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison? Community Aide	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 37

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 38

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 39

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 40

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 41

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 42

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

ACADEMY I

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

ACADEMY II

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
Media Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Library Media?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Parent Liaison?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Full Time Instructional Facilitator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Tutors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT) STATUS, SECONDARY SCHOOLS

DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
School-to-Career Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Dropout Prevention?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Health and Social Services?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
School-to-Career Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Dropout Prevention?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Health and Social Services?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

LIBERTY ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOL

Budget Authority?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
School-to-Career Coordinator?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Dropout Prevention?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Health and Social Services?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Budget Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Personnel Authority?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Representation Conforms to Code?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Professional Development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Required Positions Filled:		
School-to-Career Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Dropout Prevention?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Health and Social Services?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Technology Coordinator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

MC NAIR ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLBudget Authority? ☒ Yes ☐ NoPersonnel Authority? ☒ Yes ☐ NoRepresentation Conforms to Code? ☒ Yes ☐ NoProfessional Development? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Required Positions Filled:

School-to-Career Coordinator?* ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/ADropout Prevention?* ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/AHealth and Social Services? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/ATechnology Coordinator? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A***Guidance****SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL**Budget Authority? ☒ Yes ☐ NoPersonnel Authority? ☐ Yes ☒ NoRepresentation Conforms to Code? ☒ Yes ☐ NoProfessional Development? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Required Positions Filled:

School-to-Career Coordinator? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/ADropout Prevention? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/AHealth and Social Services? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/ATechnology Coordinator? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A**SMT did not function to capacity for a number of reasons. An election of new members will be held in September 2002.**

District Accountability Plan

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 42):

- Conduct a complete review of the district's Accountability Plan, which was submitted to the Commissioner on June 1, 1999, to assure that all sections remain relevant, workable and appropriate given the district's new focus on implementation of Whole School Reform models in all schools. Present any suggested revisions to the NJDOE for approval.
- For the 2001-02 school year, and concurrent with our review of this Plan, continue its implementation, including sections providing for:
 1. Accountability for student achievement;
 2. Recognition and rewards;
 3. Sanctions; and,
 4. Assistance for principals.

Our current Plan is available for review in the district office.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

A review of the District Accountability Plan was conducted and found to be adequate to meet district needs at this time. However, the NJDOE has sponsored a series of meetings to revise and standardize the Accountability Plan format for use by all districts. Jersey City staff have participated in these meetings. Until this format and related procedures are finalized, Jersey City will continue to implement its current Plan.

**SECTION IV:
COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT**

Involving Parents in the Education of Their Children

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 62):

Project PREP – Conceived and established **Programs to Recruit and Empower Parents**, a comprehensive, multi-faceted series of district and school-level programs and activities which have significantly elevated the quantity and degree of participation by parents in the educational process and serves as a model for replication across the State and nation. A sampling of programs planned for 2001-02 under this umbrella include:

- **Parents As Partners Conference** – a full day annual conference at NJCU with over 1,000 parents expected to attend;
- **Mini Courses** – six-week courses in self improvement and elementary curriculum areas;
- **The Communicator** – a bi-monthly parent newsletter providing relevant and timely information (this publication is a winner of the NJSBA Award for Communications);
- **Parent Calendar and Resource Directory** – annual comprehensive document which provides details about every program and event throughout the school district;
- **Parent Liaisons** – a parent advocate assigned to every elementary school to represent the interests of the parents in program and policy decisions;
- **Community Aides** – assigned at every elementary school to serve as liaisons between home and school;
- **Parent Resource Teacher** – provides technical support to parents at the school level;
- **Bi-Monthly “Chat Sessions”** – meetings with parents and community members held at geographically convenient locations throughout the district to hear concerns and solicit input regarding programs and services;
- **Regional and National Conferences** – parents are provided opportunities to attend/make presentations at parent involvement conferences across the region and nation;
- **Laptop Loaner Program** for parents and middle grade students at the former 21st Century Community Learning Centers wherein parents from each participating school collaborate on a research project for presentation to the students;
- **Safe Passage Program** (NJ Best Practice) – parent volunteers line the streets surrounding their schools and ensure that the students get to and from home and school safely;
- **Parents Organizing Parents Strategy (POPS)** – The Community Foundation worked with district staff to make this strategy available to parents in Jersey City and Elizabeth during the 1999-00 school year. Through this program, over one hundred (100) parents were trained either by the Princeton Center for Leadership Training or through district turnkey team leader trainers. The purpose of this program is to bring together diverse groups of

parents—recent immigrants and long-time residents—to collaborate on projects in the community which will foster school/community involvement and serve as an example to their children. Continuation is planned for 2001-02.

- **Parent/Community Survey** – In May 1996, the district conducted its first *Parent/Community Survey* of all elementary school households in the district to assess public perception of the effectiveness of our educational program. Data were compiled in a number of areas including Overall School Operation, District Leadership, School Leadership, School Environment/Climate, and Discipline. That *Survey* was very successful in that it provided insights that were helpful for district planning purposes. In order to provide the district with comparison data regarding parent/community perceptions, the *Survey* was repeated in May 1998 and again in June 2000. In an effort to determine where improvement or regression might have occurred over the course of these surveys, the district prepared “*A Comparison of Survey Results*” – a document which illustrates the increase/decrease in percent (based on completed surveys) from one survey to the next. The *Survey* results were extremely positive. They indicated that the community has a greater degree of satisfaction with all dimensions of the programs offered since the May 1996 *Survey*. The district is required to conduct this type of survey at least once every seven years. For 2001-02, the survey will not be completed; however, the district will continue to act on the latest *Survey* findings to address the needs and concerns of parents in the community.
- **ASPIRA** – School- and district-level workshops will be made available to interested parents in schools across the district.
- **Service Broker Program** — Each Service Broker is a licensed social worker who, through a variety of referral sources, assists parents in resolving issues which are impacting on the child’s ability to remain focused in school. The Service Broker services parents of children in grades two through eight. Parents of younger children may be seen by the Early Childhood Social Worker. The Service Broker receives cases through guidance counselors, community aides, attendance counselors, child study teams, teachers or the building administrators. Parents themselves can request assistance directly. Issues addressed by the Service Broker include lack of medical insurance for children; loss or potential loss of housing; child or adolescent mental health issues; substance abuse within the family; legal issues related to eviction, custody and immigration; and, issues related to H.I.V./AIDS. The Service Broker will assist the family by referring to a local agency that addresses the issues raised by the parent that impact upon the child.
- **Court Liaison** — The Court Liaison facilitates the exchange of information between the Jersey City Public Schools and external agencies such as Family Court, the Hudson County Juvenile Detention Center or the child’s attorney. School related information is released with a court order or signed release by the parent or guardian. This information is often utilized by the youngster’s attorney to present the educational plan for the youngster to the Court for implementation or as part of his/her probation. The Court Liaison serves as a single point of contact for school-based staff, gathering information from district staff and communicating that information, as appropriate, to

the courts. Information regarding students' illegal activity is released by the courts to the Court Liaison to help school administrators maintain safety and order in the schools.

- **Parent Handbook** — The Handbook of Educational Strategies for Learners and Parents (HELP) is a comprehensive parent handbook of suggested educational activities across subject areas that a parent can experience with their child to broaden the child's educational experience. Each activity utilizes materials that are commonly found in most homes and encourage imagination, curiosity and a love of learning.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The importance of the home/school connection has been emphasized in this district as a critical factor in the academic success of our students. Family involvement in education was recognized to produce increases in student attendance, decrease the dropout rate, raise positive parent/child communication, improve student behavior and attitudes, and increase parent/community support for the schools. The district has been very successful in this area. The following chart indicates the amount of parental contacts through our three major divisions—Programs and Services, Special Education, and Curriculum and Instruction over the past school year.

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
<p><u>TITLE I PARENT LIAISONS</u></p> <p>The parent organization of each elementary school annually elects a parent to represent the specific concerns or issues of a given building. In addition, the district representatives inform this membership of services and events that are forthcoming so that the liaisons may turnkey their parent organization membership. Periodically, at the request of the liaisons, guest administrative speakers are invited to address any needs of the group.</p>	Programs and Services	Monthly	<p>30 Liaisons, all elementary parents</p> <p>Liaisons are chosen by parents.</p>
<p><u>PARENT RESOURCE TEACHER</u></p> <p>The Parent Resource Teacher assists families in maximizing their child's education by responding to parental questions regarding their elementary child's academic program and providing parental assistance in seeking appropriate resources on an individual basis. Upon parental organization request, the Parent Resource Teacher is available for evening presentations. The Parent Resource Teacher assists building-level parent organizations in designing and implementing programs specific to the needs of the individual school. Trips are planned periodically to inform parents of educational techniques, strategies and ways to advocate for their child.</p>	Programs and Services	Daily	<p>Parent Resource Teacher; all elementary parents</p> <p>Attends at least one Parent Council meeting in every school</p>
<p><u>COMMUNITY AIDES</u></p> <p>The district employs 36 community aides housed in the local public schools. The community aide provides parental outreach and opportunities for parents to become aware and active in their child's educational program. These community aides support both the district's mission and the individual vision of the school in which they serve. Parents are encouraged to attend workshops and</p>	Programs and Services	Daily	<p>36 Community Aides; all elementary parents</p>

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
informational sessions to keep abreast of district and school initiatives. Parental contact is also made to alert and confirm the absence of individual children.			
<p><u>SERVICE BROKERS</u></p> <p>Service Brokers are master-level social workers who assist families with issues that may be contributing to children not reaching their full academic potential. Family issues often include some or a combination of the following: medical insurance, homelessness, rental assistance, H.I.V./AIDS, substance abuse, mental health, bereavement, domestic violence, custody, etc. The service broker works directly with the parent and refers them to the appropriate outside agency.</p>	Programs and Services	Daily	<p>5 Service Brokers; elementary parents</p> <p>During the 2000-01 school year, 630 families were seen and 930 referrals were made to outside agencies.</p>
<p><u>PARENT RESOURCE CALENDAR</u></p> <p>The Jersey City Public School System provides the parent of each child with a district-published calendar, complete with a description of the district schools, school organization chart and phone numbers, district programs and policies, and school-related dates of significance (including standardized State and district assessments, parent meetings, marking periods, vacation schedule, etc.). This document has become a one-stop reference document for parents.</p>	Programs and Services	Annually	<p>40,000 copies distributed to: Parents Community Members Churches</p>
<p><u>C.A.S.P.E.R. PROGRAM</u></p> <p>The C.A.S.P.E.R. Program is a not-for-profit, affordable after-school childcare program for Jersey City residents, ages 4 through 10. The program is staffed by district employees, and the parents pay a minimal fee for this service, which is available in every public primary and elementary facility. Several families are subsidized on a sliding scale</p>	Programs and Services	Daily when school is in full session	<p>1,594 children serviced and personal contact made with each parent</p>

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
based on income. The program runs from school dismissal until 6 p.m. This is a structured educational and recreational program which offers some homework assistance. This program has been in existence for approximately seventeen years.			
<p><u>COURT LIAISON</u></p> <p>School Social Worker who assists parents whose children are involved with the courts in understanding the Juvenile Justice Process. This individual also assists families in locating intervention services which may help the child and the family. The court liaison serves as the single point of contact for school-based staff, gathering information from district personnel and communicating that information, as appropriate, to the courts.</p>	Programs and Services	Daily Interaction	Annual range from 1,000 to 1,700 parental contacts each year
<p><u>PARENTS AS PARTNERS CONFERENCE</u></p> <p>Full-day, free conference of approximately 15 workshops exclusively designed to provide information to parents which address the social, emotional and educational needs of their children between Pre-K and grade 8. Courtesy transportation to and from each school is provided; breakfast and lunch are offered. Educational vendor stations and agency information booths are set up to provide parents with an overview of the materials utilized with their children during the school day and to make parents aware of agency programs within the community. This program has been in existence for six years.</p>	Programs and Services	Annually	750 parents
<p><u>THE COMMUNICATOR</u></p> <p>This publication provides various information to parents regarding proposed programs, updates on</p>	Programs and Services	Every Other Month	10,000 elementary parents; Community-Based Agencies

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
existing programs and services, and parental viewpoints on various programs. This publication was recognized for an award by the NJ School Boards for its excellence.			
<p><u>PROJECT READ-A-LONG</u></p> <p>A literacy initiative which involves teachers going into the homes of students in Kindergarten through grade 3 to read to the children in the presence of their parent. Through modeling, parents receive the opportunity to view a variety of reading strategies which are specific to their individual child. Four visits were made to each home, and the family was able to keep the literature to begin and/or expand their home library.</p>	Programs and Services	January and February 2002 (4 one-hour visits per family)	138 families with 552 home visits
<p><u>EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCES</u></p> <p>In addition to the district's parent-sponsored conference, parents visit various educational conferences , within and outside the state, to expand their knowledge base regarding learning styles, educational techniques, and parental involvement opportunities.</p>	Programs and Services	Fall and Spring National Title I Meeting (Texas) NJAPC ASPIRA NJTESOL/NJBE	6 parents 50 parents 50 parents 50 parents
<p><u>BARNES AND NOBLE TRIPS</u></p> <p>Parents at the elementary level from eleven schools are encouraged to join the district in a field trip to the Barnes and Noble bookstore where they receive a tour of the various sections of the bookstore, speak with a children's author, and purchase books for their children at district expense. Upon return to the school, lunch is served while an educator reviews various reading techniques and strategies.</p>	Programs and Services	Spring 2002	Approximately 200 parents
<p><u>TRUANCY TASK FORCE</u></p> <p>Parents are alerted on a daily basis of the absence of their children from school, as well as the location</p>	Programs and Services	Daily	Parental contact varies, but ranges between 20 to 35 per week with approximately 600 to 1,050 contacts per year.

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
of where their child was found. Parents are reminded of the educational loss their child suffers when absent and the legal ramifications for the parent.			
<u>ATTENDANCE MEETING</u> Parents of students who had excessive absences were invited to attend a meeting to address the excessive absence of their children and issues which may be preventing them from returning to school.	Programs and Services	December 2002	80 parents
<u>MAGNET FAIR</u> The Education Business Alliance Program holds a fair to inform parents and students about career choices and various magnet programs offered by the district at each of the high schools to support their career goals. Upon student acceptance, parents are invited to sign contracts with their adolescent during parent orientation. Each year, a graduation celebration salutes the accomplishments of the students involved in the magnet programs with their sponsoring community partners.	Programs and Services	Annual Event: Overview Fair Contract/Parent Orientation Graduation Ceremony	800 parents 300 parents Approx. 100 parents
<u>SAFE PASSAGE: PROJECT YELLOW JACKETS</u> Safe Passage: Project Yellow Jackets is a grassroots program developed jointly between the school district and the community through a town meeting to address parental concerns regarding the safe passage of children from their homes to the local school. Prior to the establishment of this joint venture, students were being approached by individuals to participate in illegal activities on their way to and from school. The district provided training to community volunteers on de-escalation of conflict and established formal communication and resolution within the community to address areas	Programs and Services and P.S. No. 39	Daily	20 parents

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
and patterns of behavior that aroused concern. This program helped the school and local community develop a safety net around its children and their future. This program has been in existence for five years and was awarded a NJ Best Practice.			
<p><u>“fifteen together”/PACE PROGRAM</u></p> <p>A nationally recognized School Boards MAGNA Award-winning program which integrates mentoring of at-risk high school freshman and sophomore students with parental and community support. This program successfully supports the interaction of parents in the educational component of their children’s lives. It is truly a parent/school joint project whereby parents and teachers are actively involved in the students’ lives on a daily basis. Parents are encouraged to participate in monthly school/family/community activities whereby the children learn to advocate for themselves, provide community service and develop their talents and social networking skills. In addition to the daily interaction between the adult teacher/mentor, peer leader and student, many of the events involve the interaction of the parents, mentors and adolescents off site in the community during the evenings, on weekends or during vacation. Phone calls are made to parents regularly to address academic issues and problems regarding their adolescent.</p>	Programs and Services	<p>Daily</p> <p><u>Events:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent Outreach – Cohort 4 450 parents • “Rock The Cradle” 85 parents • “Parent Orientation Breakfast” 350 parents • Juvenile Diabetes Walk 165 parents • Parents Open House for “fifteen together”/ PACE Program 222 parents • Tailgate Party 185 parents • Turkey Dinner 160 parents • Mo Talent Extravaganza 295 parents • Class Act 500 parents • Parent Outreach— Cohort 5 485 parents • Mailings to Parents 600 parents • Black History Program 262 parents • Women’s History Celebration 100 parents • Academic Awards Program 253 parents • Sister to Sister 100 parents • Brother to Brother Over 100 • Cohort 1 Graduation Celebration Over 100 	
<u>HOMELESS HOLIDAY CAMPAIGN</u>	Programs and Services	December 2002	160 families

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
District staff collected and delivered donations of clothing and toys for homeless families and neglected and delinquent youth during the holiday season.			
<u>JUMP START 2006 TOWN MEETING</u> A town meeting was held at each of the high schools to announce to parents of rising 8 th graders a program specifically targeted to orient the students to their new academic surroundings during the month of August.	Programs and Services	May 22, 2002	1,115 parents
<u>PARENTAL EMPOWERMENT WORKSHOP</u> District workshop in which parents of general and special education students receive information about how to advocate for the educational needs of their children. Four workshops were conducted.	Special Education	Annually	Approximately 50 parents per session for a total of 200 parents
<u>NEWSLETTERS</u> Various newsletters are published and distributed periodically for parents of special education children highlighting areas of specific concern related to the educational needs of their children. "Special Edition" "Reading Connection Newsletter" "Transition Bulletin"	Special Education	3 times per year Monthly 2 times per year	All Special Education parents
<u>EARLY CHILDHOOD INFORMATION FAIR</u> Fair to increase parents' awareness of the district's services to families with preschool-age children who are suspected of having developmental delays.	Special Education	Annually	Approximately 150 to 300 parents per year
<u>TRANSITION EXPO RESOURCE FAIR</u> Program for students between the ages of 12 to 21 and their parents where information is available	Special Education	Annually	Approximately 400 to 500 parents per year

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
about careers, leisure activities and other aspects related to post-secondary life.			
<u>INCLUSION ACTIVITY NIGHT</u> Interactive and informational open house to demonstrate the benefits of inclusionary practices for general and special education students.	Special Education	Annually	Approximately 50 to 150 parents
<u>PARENT/CHILD ACTIVITY NIGHT</u> Pre-K children and their parents participate in an interactive and informative evening of activities.	Special Education; Curriculum/Instruction	Bi-Annually	Approximately 205 parents
<u>CABLE BROADCASTS</u> The district's Special Education Department provides periodic broadcasts of information regarding the Transition Program and "R.A.G.E. Against Destruction."	Special Education	Ongoing	Comcast Audience
<u>CHILD FIND ADS</u> The district's Special Education Department placed advertisements in the local newspapers announcing the availability of services for children with special needs.	Special Education	Ongoing	Newspaper audience
<u>PARENT APPRECIATION BREAKFAST</u> Breakfast to honor parent volunteers for their assistance with the early childhood program throughout the school year.	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	Anticipate approximately 450 parents
<u>EVEN START PROGRAM – ESL SERVICES</u> Provide parents with English classes to promote and reinforce the importance of parental involvement in teaching their children to read and enjoy books. Children's storybooks in English are available for use by the parents.	Curriculum/Instruction	Weekly	20 parents

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
<u>EVEN START PROGRAM – IN-CLASS PARENT/CHILD ACTIVITIES</u> Five early childhood classes at P.S. No. 5 invite parents to visit monthly to participate in parent/child activities to encourage the connection between home and school and foster parental awareness of their child's learning style and growth.	Curriculum/Instruction	Monthly	Parental contact varies, but ranges between 25 to 50 per month with approximately 250 to 500 contacts per year.
<u>EVEN START PROGRAM – HOME VISITS</u> Social workers visit the homes of Even Start parents to encourage literacy within the home.	Curriculum/Instruction	Monthly	20 parents
<u>EVEN START PROGRAM – FAMILY LITERACY FIELD TRIPS</u> Even Start parents participate in four Saturday family field trips that focus on literacy.	Curriculum/Instruction	Quarterly	Approximately 40 parents per trip for a total of 160 parents
<u>EVEN START PROGRAM – CAMP BERNIE</u> Even Start parents participate in a family field trip with a focus on environmental activities for the young child.	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	40 to 50 parents
<u>FACES PROGRAM – PARENTING WORKSHOPS</u> Early Childhood Social Worker presents parenting workshops to teen mothers twice per month.	Curriculum/Instruction	Twice a month	Approximately 10 to 15 teen parents per workshop with approximately 200 to 300 contacts per year.
<u>FACES PROGRAM – HOME VISITS</u> Early Childhood Social Worker visits teen moms in their homes to assist and observe their parenting skills and answer their child development questions or concerns. Three to five visits are made weekly.	Curriculum/Instruction	Weekly	Approximately 3 to 5 home visits per week with approximately 114 to 190 contacts per year.
<u>CABLE BROADCASTS</u> The district provides educational informational	All Divisions	Ongoing	All Hudson County Residents

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
overviews about various departments and activities within the district.			
<u>BLACK TIE JAZZ BASH and HOLIDAY HALLELUJAH</u> District staff and students produce an entertainment program for the public to showcase the talent and growth of the students' performing arts skills.	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	Approximately 1,450 to 2,000 parents
<u>ART EXPO</u> Students showcase their artwork to demonstrate to the public their artistic achievement.	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	Approximately 20 to 40 parents
<u>EARLY CHILDHOOD FIELD TRIPS</u> Educationally-relevant field trips are scheduled by each early childhood teacher with a minimum of approximately 150 trips per year.	Curriculum/Instruction	Ongoing	Parental contact varies, but ranges between 5 to 10 per trip with approximately 750 to 1,500 contacts per year.
<u>PARENTING WORKSHOPS</u> Early Childhood Social Workers and Lead Teachers present parenting workshops at approximately 30 sites throughout the year.	Curriculum/Instruction	Ongoing	Parental contact varies, but ranges between 5 to 15 per workshop with approximately 150 to 450 contacts per year.
<u>HEALTH WORKSHOPS</u> Early Childhood Nurses present health workshops to parents of children in approximately 30 Day Care Centers. Principals in schools may also request to host Health Workshops for their parents as well.	Curriculum/Instruction	Ongoing	Parental contact varies, but ranges between 5 to 10 per workshop with approximately 150 to 300 contacts per year.
<u>HEALTH FAIR</u>	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	Anticipate 250 parents
<u>BOOK DISTRIBUTION</u> All parents of 3- and 4-year old registered children receive a book to read to their child and maintain in their home library.	Curriculum/Instruction	Annually	3,500 parents

ACTIVITY	DIVISION	TIMEFRAME	NUMBER INVOLVED
<p><u>PERSONALIZED GIVE-A-BOOK PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM</u></p> <p>Provide each 1st grade student with a book, <u>Peter Rabbit</u>, which is personalized with the student's name, parents' names and two friends. Students get to keep this book in their personal home library. Funding provided by a number of business and community partners, including the Jersey City Rotary—Daybreak.</p>	Curriculum/Instruction	Ongoing	More than 3,500 parents and students.

Involving Community-Based Organizations in Support of the Delivery of a Thorough and Efficient Education

The following strategies were included in the 2001-02 District Strategic Plan (page 65):

- **Interagency Task Force** – Representation from every community-based organization and government agency in the county, as well as from several businesses and industries to assure that students/parents are aware of, and have access to, health and social services, employment and training opportunities, and a variety of other support services such as mentoring, field trip sponsorship, tutoring, internships/apprenticeships; cultural and recreational activities.
- **21st Century Careers Initiative (Project Director)** – Established 15 Career Magnet Tech Prep Programs through partnerships with the business community and higher education, which will expire on December 31, 2001.
- **Opportunity Knocks 2 (OK2) Scholarship Program** – Facilitated the establishment of a scholarship program which guarantees payment of all costs for attendance at Hudson County Community College for Jersey City Public School graduates of the Class of 2002.
- **Adult Education Program** – Designed and established a comprehensive academic and vocational program that awards secondary diplomas to over 500 adult learners annually and serves an additional 5,000 annually.
- **College Collaboration** – Begun during the 1998-99 school year, this initiative continues the dialogue between the Jersey City Public Schools and institutions of higher learning. Four subcommittees addressing areas of professional development, high school college partnerships, school internships/field experiences, and student teaching met regularly during the 1999-00 school year. Resulting projects include a service learning (tutoring/mentoring) program whereby college students have assisted in public school classrooms; training of a cadre of prospective cooperating teachers (selected by principals as outstanding educators); and, sharing of the Jersey City Public School District's teacher evaluation form with college professors to assist in their preparation of future teachers.
- **Community Resource Directory** – A comprehensive document updated annually provides district staff and the Interagency Task Force with information regarding services available within the community. Services addressed in the directory include mental health, parenting, H.I.V./AIDS, immigration, housing, domestic violence, etc.
- **Ambassador Program** — The Ambassador Program consists of a cross section of fifty volunteer members of the community who provide the City's populace with accurate and up-to-date information about our schools and available programs for students, families and community members. This group meets directly with the Superintendent on a bi-monthly basis.
- **Board of Education** — Consistent with the State Board of Education's requirements as delineated in the July 2000 and 2001 State Board Resolutions, the district will work with the local Board toward the unanimous adoption of the threefold code of ethical and professional conduct, including the nepotism clause, the conflict of interest statement and

the code of ethics. Unanimous adoption of this code will provide the Jersey City Board with veto-proof authority over fiscal and budget matters.

Successful ☒

Unsuccessful ☐

Explanation of Success:

The district's efforts to involve community-based organizations in the support of our schools was very successful. Parent and community involvement programs were expanded through implementation of our Ambassador Program, Parents As Partners Conference, Liberty Lines, The Communicator, Parent Calendar/Resource Directory, Parent Handbook (winner of NJ School Boards Communication Award), Parent Liaisons, Community Aides, Parent Resource Teachers, Parent Chat Sessions, Laptop Loaner Program, Safe Passage, POPS, Attendance at Regional and National Conferences; ASPIRA Training, Service Brokers and Court Liaison.

Business and higher education partnerships were expanded. We established fifteen additional Career Magnet Tech Prep Programs through collaborative agreements with business and higher education, received support from the business community for the OK2 Scholarship Program, established partnership with NJCU for staff development to better prepare staff at Snyder High School to address the special education issues, prepared and disseminated a Community Resource Directory that includes a comprehensive list of all programs and services available to staff and parents throughout the city and county.

Our Adult Education Program provided services to over 5,000 adult learners through day and evening programs for high school diploma completion, GED Preparation, Basic Literacy, ESL, citizenship preparation, industrial/vocational self-help courses, and business/vocational self-help courses.

Our L.E.T.S. (Law Enforcement Teaching Students) Make A Difference partnership was formed this year between the Jersey City Police Department and the district as a cooperative effort to provide a safe environment in which the students of the Jersey City Public Schools can continue to thrive.


APPENDIX A

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (HSPA)**

APPENDIX A
Summary Student Performance Indicators

DICKINSON HIGH SCHOOL


TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING	71.2	81.5	74.6	82.5	74.8			
	MATH	85.3	84.2	93.2	93.7	84.8			
	WRITING	82.4	83.6	89.5	90.4	90.3			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						65.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						70.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						75.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	

 = Met or Exceeded State Standard

Note: HSPT figures are aggregate calculations.
HSPA scores are not aggregates as this is the first administration of the test.

FERRIS HIGH SCHOOL

TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING	60.5	70.6	55.6	60.9	74.6			
	MATH	67.1	64.5	72.9	73.3	81.5			
	WRITING	67.8	74.2	78.6	77.0	92.6			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						65.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						67.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						78.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	

 = Met or Exceeded State Standard

Note: HSPT figures are aggregate calculations.
HSPA scores are not aggregates as this is the first administration of the test.

LIBERTY ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOL

TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING				N/A*	N/A**			
	MATH				N/A*	N/A**			
	WRITING				N/A*	N/A**			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						50.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						50.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						50.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	

*Liberty Alternative High School opened in September 1999 with fifty (50) incoming 9th graders

**In September 2000, Liberty Alternative High School was expanded to service fifty (50) 9th graders and fifty (50) 10th graders



= Met or Exceeded State Standard

LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING	60.0	68.4	67.3	72.5	55.4			
	MATH	65.8	58.7	67.5	72.0	64.3			
	WRITING	76.1	72.5	88.8	82.4	73.1			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						50.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						54.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						63.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	



= Met or Exceeded State Standard

Note:

HSPT figures are aggregate calculations.

HSPA scores are not aggregates as this is the first administration of the test.

MC NAIR ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL

TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	MATH	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	WRITING	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						90.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						90.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						90.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	



= Met or Exceeded State Standard

Note:

HSPT figures are aggregate calculations.

HSPA scores are not aggregates as this is the first administration of the test.

SNYDER HIGH SCHOOL

TEST/ SUBJECT AREA		1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02 Benchmark	2001-02	Difference from Benchmark
High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)	READING	47.8	59.8	55.6	43.0	60.9			
	MATH	53.8	43.1	51.5	58.0	66.1			
	WRITING	61.9	67.8	71.3	74.6	79.5			
High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA)	READING						51.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	MATH						56.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	
	WRITING						70.0	Not available as of 8/29/02	



= Met or Exceeded State Standard

Note:

HSPT figures are aggregate calculations.

HSPA scores are not aggregates as this is the first administration of the test.

APPENDIX B

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)**

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	76.8	43.6	67.4	82.1	75.6	-6.5	68.7	6.9
P.S. #5	57.1	50.0	86.5	86.5	85.5	-1.0	87.5	-2.0
P.S. #6	57.1	43.1	67.7	67.7	94.8	27.1	68.9	25.9
P.S. #8	50.4	31.3	57.4	58.2	60.2	2.0	60.3	-0.1
P.S. #9	30.4	53.3	70.8	70.8	75.6	4.8	71.8	3.8
P.S. #11	56.6	40.3	78.1	78.1	85.2	7.1	79.1	6.1
P.S. #12	44.4	24.4	49.0	49.0	50.9	1.9	53.3	-2.4
P.S. #14	17.2	22.2	29.8	29.8	43.6	13.8	37.3	6.3
P.S. #15	22.7	12.5	26.1	26.1	38.7	12.6	34.3	4.4
P.S. #16	48.1	48.5	79.4	79.4	97.0	17.6	80.4	16.6
P.S. #17	29.3	32.5	64.2	64.2	78.8	14.6	66.0	12.8
P.S. #20	33.3	36.2	64.2	64.2	77.8	13.6	66.0	11.8
P.S. #22	22.4	23.9	44.1	44.1	45.9	1.8	49.3	-3.4
P.S. #23	27.0	30.8	64.2	64.2	71.6	7.4	66.0	5.6
P.S. #24	39.8	36.0	59.3	59.3	70.8	11.5	61.9	8.9
P.S. #25	41.3	39.5	75.2	75.2	79.0	3.8	76.2	2.8
P.S. #27	39.3	41.5	67.0	67.0	85.4	18.4	68.3	17.1
P.S. #28	45.0	45.7	71.3	71.3	69.1	-2.2	72.3	-3.2
P.S. #29	41.3	10.9	38.9	38.9	66.0	27.1	44.9	21.1
P.S. #30	31.4	18.2	63.2	63.2	67.8	4.6	65.2	2.6
P.S. #33	64.7	77.3	81.3	81.3	93.7	12.4	82.3	11.4
P.S. #34	22.4	24.6	35.8	35.8	48.0	12.2	42.3	5.7
P.S. #37	73.8	61.0	84.8	84.8	96.6	11.8	85.8	10.8
P.S. #38	49.4	28.3	67.9	68.0	65.6	-2.4	69.1	-3.5
P.S. #39	19.0	6.7	22.9	22.9	61.8	38.9	31.6	30.2
P.S. #41	41.4	19.3	32.9	32.9	51.5	18.6	39.9	11.6
P.S. #42	61.3	65.6	71.9	71.9	96.8	24.9	72.9	23.9
DISTRICT	39.9	34.4	60.0	60.4	71.0	10.6	62.5	8.5

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Mathematics

SCHOOL	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	81.4	48.7	39.1	46.1	36.6	-9.5	45.1	-8.5
P.S. #5	64.3	50.0	37.3	37.3	82.6	45.3	43.6	39.0
P.S. #6	68.2	47.1	57.6	57.6	65.0	7.4	60.5	4.5
P.S. #8	62.6	58.8	49.2	49.2	52.1	2.9	53.5	-1.4
P.S. #9	39.2	62.2	54.1	54.1	35.5	-18.6	57.6	-22.1
P.S. #11	69.3	65.0	58.9	58.9	63.9	5.0	61.6	2.3
P.S. #12	24.4	31.0	19.2	19.2	41.8	22.6	28.5	13.3
P.S. #14	20.9	37.5	15.8	15.8	28.2	12.4	25.7	2.5
P.S. #15	18.2	19.5	10.7	10.7	17.4	6.7	21.4	-4.0
P.S. #16	66.7	66.7	47.0	47.0	57.6	10.6	51.7	5.9
P.S. #17	28.7	26.1	34.3	34.3	52.0	17.7	41.1	10.9
P.S. #20	17.7	30.8	30.9	30.9	36.2	5.3	38.3	-2.1
P.S. #22	35.9	26.8	19.4	19.4	31.6	12.2	28.7	2.9
P.S. #23	31.3	54.2	37.6	37.6	47.2	9.6	43.8	3.4
P.S. #24	26.0	50.6	28.6	28.6	41.7	13.1	36.3	5.4
P.S. #25	40.1	56.8	54.7	54.7	69.6	14.9	58.1	11.5
P.S. #27	45.0	47.5	38.7	38.7	54.3	15.6	44.8	9.5
P.S. #28	46.7	61.0	44.6	44.6	43.0	-1.6	49.7	-6.7
P.S. #29	39.6	21.8	26.0	26.0	50.9	24.9	34.2	16.7
P.S. #30	52.1	34.4	50.0	50.0	42.4	-7.6	54.2	-11.8
P.S. #33	72.1	81.8	66.3	66.3	71.4	5.1	67.8	3.6
P.S. #34	9.3	23.6	18.1	18.1	19.3	1.2	27.6	-8.3
P.S. #37	95.4	78.0	84.7	84.7	83.9	-0.8	85.7	-1.8
P.S. #38	53.9	43.4	50.5	50.5	50.0	-0.5	54.6	-4.6
P.S. #39	11.7	20.3	20.4	20.4	39.4	19.0	29.5	9.9
P.S. #41	40.4	27.8	6.3	6.3	26.5	20.2	17.8	8.7
P.S. #42	45.1	56.3	46.9	46.9	61.3	14.4	51.6	9.7
DISTRICT	42.4	45.0	38.7	38.9	48.3	9.4	44.8	3.5

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (ESPA)

Science

SCHOOL	May 1999 Final Results (Reported in Rev. Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	May 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/06/01)	May 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	May 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 8/09/02)	Difference May 2001 to May 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	83.7	82.0	69.5	82.1	SCIENCE TEST NOT ADMINISTERED	N/A	70.5	N/A
P.S. #5	83.4	80.9	84.8	84.8		N/A	85.8	N/A
P.S. #6	83.5	81.4	79.8	79.8		N/A	80.8	N/A
P.S. #8	74.7	76.5	76.0	76.0		N/A	77.0	N/A
P.S. #9	54.5	80.0	83.3	83.3		N/A	84.3	N/A
P.S. #11	84.2	83.1	76.7	76.7		N/A	77.7	N/A
P.S. #12	53.4	72.1	55.8	55.8		N/A	59.0	N/A
P.S. #14	42.6	54.0	45.7	45.7		N/A	50.6	N/A
P.S. #15	40.3	44.7	35.4	35.4		N/A	42.0	N/A
P.S. #16	92.6	87.9	91.1	91.1		N/A	92.1	N/A
P.S. #17	62.6	60.4	75.2	76.0		N/A	76.2	N/A
P.S. #20	56.5	65.7	66.7	66.7		N/A	68.1	N/A
P.S. #22	47.6	49.3	39.7	39.7		N/A	45.6	N/A
P.S. #23	60.5	75.0	74.6	74.6		N/A	75.6	N/A
P.S. #24	60.0	72.0	71.1	71.1		N/A	72.1	N/A
P.S. #25	75.4	79.2	84.6	84.6		N/A	85.6	N/A
P.S. #27	72.4	68.7	65.4	65.4		N/A	67.0	N/A
P.S. #28	83.5	84.9	74.2	74.2		N/A	75.2	N/A
P.S. #29	51.0	43.5	51.8	51.8		N/A	55.7	N/A
P.S. #30	74.3	65.9	74.7	74.7		N/A	75.7	N/A
P.S. #33	91.2	93.9	86.3	86.3		N/A	87.3	N/A
P.S. #34	41.9	49.2	50.0	50.0		N/A	54.2	N/A
P.S. #37	95.4	88.1	86.4	86.4		N/A	87.4	N/A
P.S. #38	85.4	69.6	79.8	79.8		N/A	80.8	N/A
P.S. #39	47.5	38.3	34.7	34.7		N/A	41.4	N/A
P.S. #41	55.0	45.5	35.5	35.5		N/A	42.1	N/A
P.S. #42	74.2	71.9	71.9	71.9		N/A	72.9	N/A
DISTRICT	66.4	68.7	67.9	68.2		N/A	69.1	N/A

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

APPENDIX C

**Summary Student Performance Indicators:
GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)**

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Language Arts Literacy

SCHOOL	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	91.9	89.3	81.8	81.8	78.1	-3.7	82.8	-4.7
P.S. #5	89.6	90.9	93.5	93.5	89.7	-3.8	94.5	-4.8
P.S. #6	93.7	89.4	93.2	93.2	83.8	-9.4	94.2	-10.4
P.S. #8	85.2	80.5	71.8	71.8	66.6	-5.2	72.8	-6.2
P.S. #9	69.4	70.4	66.7	66.7	15.4	-51.3	68.1	-52.7
P.S. #11	82.5	73.3	81.4	81.4	74.0	-7.4	82.4	-8.4
P.S. #12	59.1	60.0	63.6	63.6	20.5	-43.1	65.5	-45.0
P.S. #14	61.4	56.0	42.9	42.9	47.1	4.2	48.3	-1.2
P.S. #15	54.8	36.7	21.2	21.2	32.4	11.2	30.2	2.2
P.S. #16	87.6	92.0	93.3	93.3	80.0	-13.3	94.3	-14.3
P.S. #17	79.0	78.6	69.3	69.3	62.8	-6.5	70.3	-7.5
P.S. #22	63.2	61.3	48.8	48.8	68.2	19.4	53.2	15.0
P.S. #23	85.6	89.6	81.7	81.7	82.2	0.5	82.7	-0.5
P.S. #24	75.3	91.0	93.2	93.2	82.7	-10.5	94.2	-11.5
P.S. #25	94.7	96.6	94.6	94.6	93.2	-1.4	95.6	-2.4
P.S. #27	98.8	92.4	92.2	92.2	78.6	-13.6	93.2	-14.6
P.S. #28	88.3	88.7	84.0	84.0	95.1	11.1	85.0	10.1
P.S. #34	62.7	61.8	64.4	64.4	45.0	-19.4	66.2	-21.2
P.S. #37	87.2	93.2	83.4	83.4	74.1	-9.3	84.4	-10.3
P.S. #38	90.1	86.0	76.9	76.9	86.4	9.5	77.9	8.5
P.S. #39	56.1	74.2	82.3	82.3	51.9	-30.4	83.3	-31.4
P.S. #40	83.6	76.6	55.3	55.3	61.3	6.0	58.6	2.7
P.S. #41	36.5	46.1	49.4	49.4	50.0	0.6	53.7	-3.7
Academy I	67.0	57.7	64.8	64.8	59.3	-5.5	66.5	-7.2
Academy II	22.6	27.9	15.0	15.0	11.6	-3.4	25.0	-13.4
DISTRICT	76.2	74.5	69.9	69.9	65.9	-4.0	70.9	-5.0

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Mathematics

SCHOOL	March 1999 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 1999 State Summary)	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	37.8	53.6	45.4	45.4	84.4	39.0	50.3	34.1
P.S. #5	72.4	84.8	96.8	96.8	92.3	-4.5	97.8	-5.5
P.S. #6	65.3	61.8	83.8	83.8	69.8	-14.0	84.8	-15.0
P.S. #8	67.9	54.8	56.5	57.7	37.3	-20.4	59.6	-22.3
P.S. #9	34.3	48.1	36.7	36.7	7.7	-29.0	43.1	-35.4
P.S. #11	67.5	71.1	79.5	79.5	80.0	0.5	80.5	-0.5
P.S. #12	17.8	14.3	27.3	27.3	7.7	-19.6	35.3	-27.6
P.S. #14	30.2	29.2	21.4	21.4	20.5	-0.9	30.3	-9.8
P.S. #15	16.7	13.4	16.7	16.7	9.5	-7.2	26.4	-16.9
P.S. #16	62.5	56.0	76.7	80.0	84.0	4.0	77.7	6.3
P.S. #17	50.6	55.4	58.2	58.2	69.2	11.0	61.0	8.2
P.S. #22	22.9	22.6	43.9	43.9	60.0	16.1	49.1	10.9
P.S. #23	77.3	73.1	85.4	85.4	83.8	-1.6	86.4	-2.6
P.S. #24	52.4	55.0	72.7	72.7	61.7	-11.0	73.7	-12.0
P.S. #25	64.2	78.0	81.5	81.5	77.8	-3.7	82.5	-4.7
P.S. #27	74.0	82.3	74.5	74.5	74.7	0.2	75.5	-0.8
P.S. #28	54.4	52.2	60.7	60.7	69.8	9.1	63.1	6.7
P.S. #34	35.3	30.9	64.4	64.4	55.0	-9.4	66.2	-11.2
P.S. #37	33.3	40.7	76.0	76.0	44.5	-31.5	77.0	-32.5
P.S. #38	57.6	56.0	54.8	54.8	59.1	4.3	58.2	0.9
P.S. #39	29.3	43.8	73.5	73.5	31.0	-42.5	74.5	-43.5
P.S. #40	41.9	51.2	69.9	69.9	48.8	-21.1	70.9	-22.1
P.S. #41	7.0	6.6	12.9	12.9	14.7	1.8	23.3	-8.6
Academy I	61.0	50.9	61.3	61.3	59.6	-1.7	63.6	-4.0
Academy II	7.3	6.9	9.0	10.3	6.0	-4.3	20.0	-14.0
DISTRICT	48.3	48.4	58.5	58.7	53.9	-4.8	61.3	-7.4

Note: In 1999, the State Standard was 85 percent passing; in 2000, the State Standard was changed to 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.

GRADE EIGHT PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (GEPA)

Science

SCHOOL	March 2000 Final Results (Reported in Jan. 2001 State Summary)	March 2001 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 6/08/01)	March 2001 Final Results (Reported in Dec. 2001 State Summary)	March 2002 Initial Report of Results (Report Printed 7/01/02)	Difference March 2001 to March 2002	2002 Benchmark	Difference from Benchmark
P.S. #3	57.2	39.4	42.4	53.1	10.7	45.3	7.8
P.S. #5	63.6	77.4	77.4	79.5	2.1	78.4	1.1
P.S. #6	67.1	85.1	85.1	80.3	-4.8	86.1	-5.8
P.S. #8	54.8	63.6	63.6	53.9	-9.7	65.5	-11.6
P.S. #9	25.9	50.0	50.0	15.4	-34.6	54.2	-38.8
P.S. #11	68.8	70.5	70.5	64.0	-6.5	71.5	-7.5
P.S. #12	25.7	50.0	50.0	15.4	-34.6	54.2	-38.8
P.S. #14	43.8	33.3	33.3	47.0	13.7	40.3	6.7
P.S. #15	16.9	15.2	15.2	25.7	10.5	25.2	0.5
P.S. #16	56.0	83.3	83.3	72.0	-11.3	84.3	-12.3
P.S. #17	43.4	44.3	44.3	58.5	14.2	49.4	9.1
P.S. #22	14.5	48.7	48.7	44.4	-4.3	53.1	-8.7
P.S. #23	70.2	63.5	63.5	72.6	9.1	65.4	7.2
P.S. #24	58.0	57.9	57.9	62.9	5.0	60.8	2.1
P.S. #25	80.4	85.9	85.9	83.7	-2.2	86.9	-3.2
P.S. #27	74.7	76.7	76.7	78.6	1.9	77.7	0.9
P.S. #28	50.7	78.2	78.2	79.4	1.2	79.2	0.2
P.S. #34	23.6	54.2	54.2	35.9	-18.3	57.7	-21.8
P.S. #37	49.2	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	68.1	-1.4
P.S. #38	67.8	65.9	65.9	79.6	13.7	67.4	12.2
P.S. #39	34.4	55.9	55.9	24.1	-31.8	59.1	-35.0
P.S. #40	41.6	53.4	53.4	53.2	-0.2	57.0	-3.8
P.S. #41	19.7	29.4	29.4	26.5	-2.9	37.0	-10.5
Academy I	50.9	60.2	60.2	59.1	-1.1	62.7	-3.6
Academy II	13.7	12.3	12.3	17.6	5.3	22.8	-5.2
DISTRICT	48.2	56.9	57.0	57.3	0.3	59.9	-2.6

Note: In 2000, the State Standard was 75 percent passing. Cells have been highlighted in yellow where the State Standard has been met or exceeded.